continuity in these three categories is maintained in the Board till a comprehensive scheme comes.. That is actually what that would assure the depositors. That is what I have to say.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I have already clarified that as the law stands at the moment, it is not within my power to make such a distinction. But I have also assured the House that when we take up the amendment of the law, we will keep this in mind and make the provision in such a way that these categories of Directors are separately treated from the other categories.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Mukherjee, does this answer meet your point?

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, in view of the assurance given by the Minister that the continuity would be maintained, I withdraw the Statutory Motions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Does he have the leave of the House to withdraw his Statutory Motions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

The Statutory Motions, by leave, were withdrawn.

THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL, 2000

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YASHWANT SINHA): Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 2000-2001, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the amounts provided in the Bill are inclusive of the sums already authorised in the Appropriation Vote on Account Act, 2000, No. 5 of 2000.

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) : Shri Arjun Singh. Arjun Singhji, your party has one hour and there are four speakers.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me this opportunity to express my views on the Appropriation Bill presented by the hon. Finance Minister for consideration of the House. This is the final stage or the penultimate stage of the consideration of the Budget estimates for 2000-2001 and it would be appropriate in my view to review the broad functioning of this Government in the last year and also try to assess the direction into which this Government wants to move in the coming financial year.

At the same time, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House, and also the attention of the hon. Finance Minister, to certain aspects which need to be looked at because, after all, the Budget estimates are only a means to carry out the governance of this country. The whole gamut of economic and financial activities of this Government, in my view, veers round to what is now come to be known as globalisation or liberalisation or economic reforms. I am not against either of these, in principle, but it would be prudent in my view that while we take one step forward or while we take any step forward, we should pause and think as to what impact that measure or that step would have on the broad mass of the people of this country, who still constitute the weaker sections, the poorer sectors and those living below the poverty line.

We have said; and we commonly use a metaphor "reforms with a human face". There is no dispute about this metaphor, but that this metaphor does not become a meaningless metaphor is something which we have to look at. That is something which not only we, but, I am sure, the Government also would like to look at . While everyone in this country, and also in this House, appreciates the pioneering spirit of the great leaders for making the industrial revolution in this country--and you can take the name of some leading people--we must also clearly understand that the face to which reference has been made cannot be the face of these great captains of the industry. That face, Sir, will have to be the face envisioned by none else but the Father of this nation, and that face, Sir, is the face of Daridranarayan, in all his pathos and simplicity. Every step that is taken must, therefore, conform to his interest, must serve his interest, and, I think, you remember that on the morrow of independence, Gandhiji gave a talisman to this nation, specially to those in whom the nation entrusted the responsibility and the authority to govern. It was a simple talisman that all those who exercise authority in the name of the nation must, at all times, before they take an

action which affects the millions of his countrymen, pause and consider whether that step adds or subtracts to the burden of the Daridranarayan.

It is distressing for me to note, and I must say with all sincerity, that we have seen that many of the steps taken in this regard, in the scheme of things, have added to the woes, anxieties and burdons of the common man. When I say this, I am not trying to prescribe anything. But I am only sounding a note of caution because this world has witnessed, in many parts, in many countries, the stark reality that has come out at the end of the day, where the people in authority, perhaps, out of compulsion and, sometimes, out of naivete, pursued recklessly the path of reforms, especially, in the developing countries. I see no compulsion for this country to relive that experience. Therefore, I expect this Government, while going on with its activities, will reassure this House, from time to time, that in every action that is contemplated, to the extent possible, there will be a consensus behind it, and that certainly it will be contemplated and acted upon with this overriding consideration in view.

The second thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Finance Minister, and I am sure he will agree with me on this, is that the future of this country, the progress and happiness of this country, depends, even today, primarily on what happens in the agricultural sector. The latest Economic Survey, which was placed before the House, gives a clear indication that there is stagnation. The rate of growth of agricultural production is not going up as it should, both to create a bulwark for the Indian economy and to provide the wherewithal to alleviate poverty in the rural sector. There was a stage when the Green Revolution was ushered in, when the country made a quantum jump from an almost impoverished agricultural economy, when it was said that India lived because it imported foodgrains from the port to the mouth of the hungry people in this country. Today, we are self-sufficient in foodgrains. It is an achievement of the Indian farmer. It is an achievement of the policies and programmes which were introduced at that time, which enabled the country to get over that period of anxiety and scarcity. Now also I think it is time when the policies and programmes in this sphere should be focussed entirely on the farmer. Nothing should be done to circumscribe either his initiative or his achievements. This should be constantly kept in view, while dealing with the pressures that are being built, whether it is in the case of seeds or any other things.

In this regard, I wish to give an illustration. The hon. Finance Minister is quite aware that, today, soyabean is a crop which has become the mainstay of marginal and small farmers, across the country. I come from a State where, according to my knowledge, nearly, 75% of the entire soyabean crop of the country is grown. I know for sure that this happened because, at the beginning of the Green Revolution, Madhya Pradesh adopted to promote this crop, gave incentives; that is why, Madhya Pradesh is called the soyabean State of the country. Soyabean is a crop, is a commodity, which has great and diverse uses. It is, in a way, a thing which provides nutrition to the poor people. But I think, the manner in which it is being treated today, needs to be reviewed, both by way of import substitution and exports put together, soyabean accounts for a saving of nearly Rs.3,000 crores of foreign exchange. And yet, the excise on this crop and its products has been increased, whereas the Finance Minister granted concessions to pepsi cola and coca cola. If this is not true... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Actually, this is not correct. I have not granted excise duty concessions to pepsi cola, coca cola.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Also, don't do that.

AN HON MEMBER: That is another issue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): It is only a caution.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: But that does not mean that he should not look at the needs of the people engaged in growing soyabean.

SHRI SANGH PRIYA GAUTAM: It is another way of getting an assurance.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Well, I am not seeking an assurance. I admire my esteemed friend, Shri Sinhaji, whom I happen to know even when he was not the Finance Minister. I know he will try to do the right thing. Another thing to which I wish to draw his attention to is this. He has made a lot of it. I do not blame him because, last year, a lot of fun was made at his cost that he is a roll-back Minister. So, this year, he has put his face against any roll-backs. We have a point of view and we should stick to that point of view. The subsidies that he has withdrawn on fertilizers have affected the farmers adversely; the subsidies that he has withdrawn on the PDS and foodgrains

have affected the common man adversely and he should have a look at it and withdraw the cuts. But, at the same time, if he is adamant about this, atleast, he must look at the status and the volume of, what you call, Non-Performing Assets. I wanted to use the right word. You know better than me what non-performing assets mean. Their volume, according to current estimates, is something of the order of Rs.58,000 crores. And, of the loan lent by banks, 18% are in the category of non-performing assets.

If the determination shown by the Finance Minister in not rolling back his view on subsidy could also be shown with equal vigour in the assurances that he has given, time and again, that he would reduce the volume of these assets, I think, an opportunity could arise where he could have a more rational approach towards the entire issue of subsidy because that is needed. Unless we adopt a rational approach towards subsidy, any lopsided decisions are ad hoc decisions. But if you balance them, I think you can arrive at something which is much more rational. I know his difficulties. The fact is these assets are in the hands of the people whom he cannot touch. Whereas, the farmers and the common men are the people who cannot assert themselves. I think that is a distinction which should not be of consequence to us and we should see that this kind of imbalance does not exist. The other issue which needs to be looked at and which is assuming grave proportions is the issue of unemployment. As we travel around the country-- Sir, I am sure, that must be your experience also - we find that the growing number of unemployed and the growing number amongst the educated unemployed is assuming a dimension which will be of grave consequence to the future of our society. The House would like to know as to what are the specific things which the Government has in mind to tackle this gigantic problem. This is not a partisan issue. I am sure, every section of the House would like to lend whatever support it can to any meaningful effort or scheme to ease the unemployment situation in this country.

श्री गया सिंह : आपकी तरफ से ही कुछ सुझाव आना चाहिए ।

श्री अर्जुन सिंह : जहां मुझे सुझाव देना होगा, वहां मैं दूंगा ।

The second point which I want to raise is this. I have put a heading on my point which I am hesitant to use publicly, but I see no way out, i.e. 'reach and power of narcotics'. Sir, this subject is directly under the charge of the hon. Finance Minister. Shri Giorgio Geocomelli, the Director of the United

Nations International Drug Control Programme says, "The drug phenomenon is unique in a number of aspects of people's lives which it affects -- the health of the individual, political and economic development, the safety of the streets and the stability of Governments. We must approach drug abuse by first understanding its relationship with other issues affecting the society. As drug abuse affects more and more countries the power of international drug traffic organizations threatens to corrupt and destabilize the institutions of Government." For us in India there is a need to give some thought to it because geographically, we are situated between the Golden Triangle on the East and the Golden Crescent on the West. And, according to estimates that keep appearing in newspapers and official documents, the dimension of illicit drug trade figures somewhere between Rs.60,000-65,000 crores. Sir, these fantastic astronomical figures are used by hostile interests for penetrating into our economic and political problems. A report in the Times of India on 1st May, 2000, which refers to the recent Annual Report of the U.S. State Department on Terrorism, says, and I quote: "The Report seems to suggest that an explosive cocktail of religion and ideology fanned by drug traffickers and illegal trade was motivating fanatical groups rather than pure politics." In fact, Sir, it would be a little drastic; I think, it needs to be said that we seem to be under-sieged by a menace which is growing by the day and which seems to be getting out of control, and we don't have a clue as to how we should go about it. Time and again we have heard from our hon. Home Minister about how the terrorism in this country - it not only affects our borders but it also affects the entire country - is fuelled by narcotic funds. He had promised a White Paper on ISI and other things, but it has still not seen the light of the day. I do not know why. In these matters, it is only an informed and an effective public opinion which can come to the rescue of the country, and with this informed public opinion and firm determination of the Government, it is, perhaps, possible to tackle this menace. But the first step will have to be taken by the Government. And we would very much like to know what initiatives the Finance Minister would like to take - though he cannot do it alone but, at least, he can initiate measures which this Government will help in taking forward - and in which, I am quite sure, all sections of this House will join because the challenge is not to a Government, not to a party or to a system, but the challenge is to the very identity and the future of this nation, its viability, its freedom and its existence. That is how I look at it.

Sir, as we approach now the beginning of the 21st century, inevitably, we have to glance backward and see what we have witnessed in the last century. It has been a century of cataclysmic events - rise and fall of empires, clash of nations fuelled by imperial ambitions, explosion of knowledge, the ever-widening frontiers of scientific research and achievement; even the stirring up of a hope to create a brave new world which spurred the Russian Revolution, though much has not come out of it ultimately.

We have seen, the ascent and decline of the fascists which spawned two World Wars that devastated nations across the globe and which resulted in the annihilation of millions and millions of people. Untold misery and oppression took place. At the same time, Sir, through this haze of gun powder, this clash and the dust and din of history, India had its own tryst with destiny. Hardly a hundred metres from this place, midnight of 14-15th August 1947, a nation was born. Any birth is a miracle. The birth of a nation of 30 crores of people is more than a miracle. Many of us were fortunate to witness it. Therefore, today, Sir, when we look back, we cannot help remembering and cherishing what we have achieved. India is an old civilization, but a new nation. Thousands of years' old civilization, a multi-lingual, multi-racial, multi-cultural and multi-religions incharacter metamorphosised itself into a modern Indian State on 15th August, 1947. This new modern State adopted a Constitution, as its sheet- anchor, on 26th January, 1950. Why I am saying all this, Sir, is not because of academic interest. We have to evaluate today and see how we have existed in these last fifty years. In my view, this modern India rests entirely and wholly on the fulcrum of secularism. You destroy that fulcrum, you disturb it, then the entire country will go for a spin. That is where our anxieties arise because we are witnessing, unfortunately, an attempt not only to dilute, but also to derail it; whether it is an attack on Christians or minorities or whether it is an attempt on .....

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सर, अर्जुन सिंह जी एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल पर बोल रहे थे, बोलते-बोलते सेक्युलरिज्म कहां से आ गया? इतना बड़ा विषयांतर - पेंडुलम बिल्कुल एकदम घूम गया। लेकिन एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल में यह कहां तक तर्क-संगत है, मैं इस पर आपकी रूलिंग चाहूंगी?...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी) : आपने कहा था कि मैं वाइडर पर्सपेक्टिव पर बोल रहा हूं...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : वाइडर की कोई तो सीमा होगी, कुछ परिधि होगी।...**(व्यवधान)**...या वाइडर का मतलब है कि जो चाहें, जहां चाहें बोल सकें।...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी) : नहीं ऐसा नहीं है।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: You cannot make that point of order. Under which rule are you making that point of order? Please quote the rule. Sir, the hon. Member must quote the rule.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : जो सुषमा जी ने मामला उठाया है वह सही है, उस पर विचार कर लीजिए।...**(व्यवधान)**... थोड़ा सा करेक्शन पर भी बोल दें तो अच्छा रहेगा।...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी. एन. चतुर्वेदी) : नहीं, नहीं। वह अपना समय देखेंगे और उसी लिहाज से उनकी पार्टी के अन्य सदस्यों को बोलना है।

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, I will take another five or six minutes.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज : सर, सवाल समय का नहीं है, सवाल विषय का है। वे जितना चाहे समय लें, उनकी पार्टी के सदस्यों का समय है। वह पूरा समय ले सकते हैं। सवाल विषय का है, वस्तुस्थिति का है।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: You cannot take the rule like that. *(Interruptions)* What is the rule? *(Interruptions)* You cannot say like that.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी. एन. चतुर्वेदी) : उसको उन्होंने अपने ढंग से जोड़ने की कोशिश की है।...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY (Tamil Nadu) : There is a rule.

SHRI C. P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU (Pondichery) : It is under Rule 124. It is very clear. Let me read it out. Rule 124 says:-

"On the day on which such motion is made or on any subsequent day to which the discussion is postponed, the principles of the Bill and its general provisions may be discussed, but the details of the Bill must not be discussed further than is necessary to explain its principles".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI): No, no. He is coming to it.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: What I have been saying - and I have been saying it with a sense of responsibility - is that we are at the stage of apportioning funds to this Government and we have a right to discuss how we feel these funds are going to be utilised, the direction that this Government will take, the effect of this on the polity of this country. We cannot avoid it. Whether somebody likes it or not, it is immaterial. *(Interruptions)* Yes, Madhya Pradesh is very much part of it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Arjun Singh, please wind up now.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, by the time I wind up, there will be a storm in the treasury benches.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) : But you are here to enlighten the people, not to create a storm, much less a tempest in the tea-cup. *(Interruptions)*

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे (बिहार) : हर सदस्य का अपना बोलने का अंदाज होता है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...उनका अपना यही अंदाज है। वह अपने अंदाज से बोल रहे हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Just a minute, Sir. He had given a wrong quotation. This is a Money Bill. The rule he quoted was about a Bill other than the Money Bill. So, what was he quoting? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI C. P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: No, it wasn't wrong. The rule says that you are not entitled to discuss even the details of the Bill which means that you cannot discuss anything except the Bill. That is the interpretation of Rule 124.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: No, Sir. It is very clear. You are quoting a wrong rule here. *(Interruptions)* It is about a Bill other than the Money Bill. *(Interruptions)* You can interrupt the speech, but do not quote a wrong rule.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T. N. CHATURVEDI) : Mr Vayalar Ravi, please sit down.

श्रीमती सरोज दुबे : इतने वरिष्ठ नेता को भी ये बोलना सिखाना चाहते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री अर्जुन सिंह : अब कुछ भी सीखना पड़ेगा बहन जी। लेकिन हम वह नहीं सीखेंगे जो ये सिखाना चाहते हैं।

Sir, even now, the effort by certain outfits to create dissensions amongst various communities of this country is a matter of grave concern to us. Now, even the Sikh community has been brought in - a community of brave, patriotic and progressive people, who made great contribution to the development of this country. An effort is being made... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): I think you can avoid saying this kind of a thing. Otherwise, they will bring in some other unfortunate episode and it will create... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: There is no question of any episode, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) : You should be speaking on the Appropriation Bill.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: I am speaking on the Appropriation Bill. I am within my rights and I want to say very clearly...

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI) : Will the hon. Member yield for a minute? Sir, I do wish to compliment him for having delivered a very statesmanlike speech, a thought-provoking speech. He has made a number of points. Must he, at the end of it, spoil the whole thing by putting in some very, very unseemly controversial things? I mean, it is like he has produced buckets of pure milk and now he spoils it by a few droppings.

Sir, he has given a notice to the hon. Prime Minister, under rule 238(A). He has given notice that he is going to make some statement. If he makes a passing reference, we will treat it with indifference. If he wishes to seriously go into that, then, Sir, we have a very serious point of order to raise and you will kindly hear us before we allow him to go into that.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, I have already informed. I never brought this subject up, but it is you who have brought this up.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have received a copy of it. I would not be here otherwise. The hon. Finance Minister would be here.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: I have already received a communication from the Secretariat saying that there was no need for this notice because I was

not going to make any allegations or insinuations against anybody. You can rest be assured that there will be no allegations against anyone. With regard to questions, yes; if questions can't be asked in this House, where else will they be asked then?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Let us not quibble over words. If the hon. Member wishes to raise the contents of that letter, namely, inconsistency of two oaths, let me put it straightaway. We have a serious objection. We must raise our point of order. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: I have not said anything. Do you want to intimidate me?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have respectfully requested to hear me. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Let me see what he has to say. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) : Sir, I would like to seek your ruling. The normal practice is, when I want to bring any allegation or any remark or any comment against any individual Minister or any private Member, I am to intimate the private Member concerned. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether Mr. Arjun Singh has sent a notice to him, in the capacity as a Minister or in the capacity as a Member. Otherwise, where is his *locus standi* to intervene in the matter? Therefore, the concept of collective responsibility is not applicable here. Umpteen number of rulings have been there in the book to say where the concept of collective responsibility comes and where the concept of collective responsibility stops. The question is, if a Member wants to bring any point, should Parliamentary courtesy and etiquette demand that he should forewarn the Member or the Minister concerned? Here, somebody else is coming. This question arises in the matter of questions, in the matter of calling attention motions and even in the matter of individuals. I do not know what point he is going to raise. I am hearing such a point of order for the first time. Mr. Minister, have you received any notice from Mr. Arjun Singh? Sir, what is his *locus standi*? Has any question been put to him? Is he going to give any personal explanation? Where is the question of representing somebody?

4.00 P.M.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, it is a short answer to what the hon. Member says. A notice given by Mr. Arjun Singh has been delivered to the hon. Prime Minister. It is the property of the whole Government. *(Interruptions)* Let me complete the sentence. I am not here making a statement as a Minister. I am also a Member of the House. As a Member of the House, I am entitled to raise any point of order against any portion of the speech which I think is contrary to the rules of procedure. I know exactly what you are going to say. I politely, therefore, told you not to spoil the things. If you take my little advice, it is well and good. If you do not, then I must get up and raise my point of order, as a Member.

SHRI JIBON ROY: He cannot intimidate the Member. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Do I look like that? ..*(Interruptions)*... Merely saying that I am on a point of order does not mean that it is intimidation. ... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Mr. Jibon Roy, you need not bother. ... *(Interruptions)*... Mr. Pranab Mukherjee has already made his point. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I am prepared to wait for another two minutes. ... *(Interruptions)*... When he comes to what I regard as a breach of rules of procedure... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: What you consider to be the breach of rules from your point of view..*(Interruptions)*... I have not said anything and I do not intend to say anything against you. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If you say anything about my colleagues, it is my ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: But, not in this case. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I am sorry here I do not agree with you. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, the head of this Government is the Prime Minister and as Prime Minister it is his primary duty to create, according to

me, create an atmosphere to safeguard the rights of every citizen of this country. This is his first and the foremost duty. It is in this context, Sir, that I have put this question publicly outside this House. But there has been no answer. Now I want to put this question inside this House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Is this an appropriate occasion? This is not a discussion on the President's Address. This is not a discussion on any such issue. This is purely a financial matter. That is why I think this is not an appropriate time. Apart from the other implications, you, as a Member, can exercise your right. There will be a number of occasions when you can always exercise your right. But, this is a financial matter that we are discussing. This is all that I am again saying.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, I will not contest your ruling. I will not contest whatever ruling you give. I know that is that last thing that I should do. But, as I said in the very beginning the Appropriation Bill is a vehicle to provide funds to the Government for its functioning and what should be the nature of Government's functioning is legitimately the realm of this discussion. When you talk of an Appropriation Bill, this has been done in other Houses. We have seen it happen. I thought I was within my right to do that. If you say, if you rule otherwise, I will accept that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Please.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Therefore, Sir, in this background that I have just mentioned, the question is relevant that the Prime Minister has on more than one occasions has said that he is proud to be a member of the RSS. According to the information that we have, one has to subscribe this oath that I quote.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): How is this relevant to the matter? ..*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: This is exactly what I was saying. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka) : Sir, for the information of the hon. Member, I would like to say that there is no membership in the RSS.... *(Interruptions)*.. I do not know what the position is now. *(Interruptions)*... But during all these years, there has been no membership in the RSS.*(Interruptions)*... It is a nationalist philosophy. ... *(Interruptions)*..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): You have already spoken for 40 minutes. There are other Members also who want to speak on this. You have to keep that also in mind.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Sir, I was waiting for your ruling. If you rule it out on this occasion, then I will have to raise it on some other occasion. But if you rule.... *(Interruptions)*....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): You can raise this point when there is an occasion where this thing can be fitted. This is something about the financial matter. Even if you stretch your imagination, I do not think it will conform to the requirements of the financial matters. This is only what I want to bring to your notice. ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: About this ruling... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Are you questioning the ruling given by the Chair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): I have not given any ruling.

I am only, again and again, inviting the attention of the hon. Members as to what is the purport of rule 121. And, that is why, I have said that there may be other occasions, when many other issues of like-nature or, the same or, I mean, the way you want it, can be raised. But, probably, this is not the occasion. That is what I would like to advise.

SHRI ARJUN SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I think, I am within my rights to ask this question because it has a direct bearing on the conduct of the Government...

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I am on a point of order. Sir, rule 124 is a follow-up of rule 121. Rule 124 has not come from anywhere. What does rule 121 say? It says, "When a Bill originating in the House has been passed by the House and is transmitted to the Council, the Bill shall, as soon as may be, be laid on the Table." This Bill is a Money Bill. It is not an ordinary Bill for legislation. This is, of course, a legislation. But, the Money Bill's concept stands on a different footing. When a Money Bill is discussed or even when the Budget is discussed, everybody discusses everything which is of political concern. It is for the first time in the House we are hearing that you cannot discuss politics. It is not correct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) : Not all subjects. It has not been the practice of this House to discuss all the subjects, but here the subject which really relates, pertains, directly or indirectly to the financial matters.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Sir, I am referring to page 650 of Practice and Procedure of Parliament by Kaul and Shakdhar. This page deals with 'Scope of Discussion' on the Appropriation Bills. It reads, "The debate on an Appropriation Bill is restricted to matters of public importance or administrative policy implied in the grants covered by the Bill and which have not already been raised while the relevant Demands for Grants were under discussion. The various points that have been discussed at length during the course of the debates relating to the various Demands for Grants cannot be the subject-matter of discussion..." These are the exceptions. It does not fall within the exceptions. So, the main provision, so far as it permits, is 'any matter of public importance or administrative policy.' I submit, respectfully, the point which the Member has made...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Governed by the provisions of the Bill.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI) : That is the point. That is the over-riding parameter from which you have read out.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Normally, as a rule, what is allowed is 'matters of public importance or administrative policy' implied in the grants covered by the Bill and which have not already been raised while the relevant Demands for Grants were under discussion. Then, there are exceptions. The various points that have been discussed at length, during the course of the debate, relating to various Demands for Grants cannot be the subject-matter of discussion on Appropriation Bills. Subjects on which cut motions were moved and negatived during the discussion on Demands for Grants are not permitted to be discussed again during the discussion on Appropriation Bills. Then, whatever is not relevant to the discussion on Demands for Grants is also not relevant to the debate on the Appropriation Bills. I submit, respectfully, that you will have to consider whether or not what the hon. Shri Arjun Singh is saying is not covered by the exceptions but by the rules which permit discussion of any matter of public importance or

administrative policy. If it does so, then, I submit, he is within his right to make a reference to what he is referring to.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): May I remind you? This House does not discuss the Grants.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: No, no. I am not on Grants. I am on the question of Appropriation Bill. Look at the Index. The Index says, 'Appropriation Bills.' It is an Appropriation Bill. There is no distinction so far as the scope of the discussion is concerned and it, in turn, says that the debate on an Appropriation Bill is restricted to matters of public importance or administrative policy implied in the grants covered by the Bill. Unless you waive the rule that it is not a matter of public importance and it is not an administrative policy implied in the grants, it does not fall within the exceptions. That is my submission.

Sir, through you, I would only like to submit very respectfully that I have been in this House for a very long time. The convention of the House has not been to clamp any restrictions when a Member normally wants to speak on any of the Money Bills, unless something is really objectionable, and unless it is going against the rules. But in the light of this commentary, so clear, that any matter of public importance and any matter of administrative policy implied in the grant for the Appropriation Bill, can be raised, he must be permitted to speak.... *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER: The RSS is coming into the picture. The question is... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Let Mr. Pranab Mukherjee speak.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, so far as this House is concerned, we do not discuss the Demands. Over the years, we have built up a convention, as the other House discusses the Demands, it passes the Appropriation Bill without discussion because all the sanctions had already been discussed, the guillotine has been applied. The Appropriation Bill is practically the reflection of that. But in this House, as we do not pass the Grants, we take the opportunity of discussing various policy matters. So far as precedence is concerned, and I can refer to, for the information of Shri Ram Jethmalani and Shri Venkaiah Naidu, a similar occasion. While an Appropriation Bill was being piloted by me as a junior Minister in 1974,

Shri Rajnarain, sitting on this side, discussed the entire matter of his pleading, what he was arguing in the Allahabad High Court against Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The point to which I am trying to draw your attention is... *(Interruptions)* This is on record. Mr. Ram Jethmalani, you kindly go through the record of this House. The then Vice-Chairman, Shri J.P. Mathur, was presiding over the House. I helplessly tried to impress upon the Chair, "Sir, it is outside the purview; but this House has been a little bit indulgent". I am not suggesting that you be indulgent. But, most respectfully I would like to submit that the Government has every right to review, after listening to the points which the hon. Member is going to make. But if the hon. Member is prevented from speaking, I think it will not be proper. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, we agree; we are helpless. *(Interruptions)* We agree; we are helpless. *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN): After hon. Pranabda has given an illustrious precedent, and the comparison involved in it, I think, we should listen to Shri Arjun Singhji, what he wants to say. We have no objection from our side. Let him speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): Shri Arjun Singh was making some very valid points regarding the economic and financial problems, but when I felt that there was a departure from the trend, I only brought to his notice that, probably, this was not the occasion to discuss this particular matter, there will be many more occasions when whatever he wanted to say, he could say. Certainly, I would like to assure Mr. Salve, and he knows also that I am the last person who tries to clamp any restriction on what... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: Sir, I am the last person to cast any aspersions... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI T.N. CHATURVEDI): I know. I know. *(Interruptions)* But what I said was, far from any intention to clamp any restrictions of any kind, I was only trying to impress upon him that there may be occasions for him to say whatever he wanted to say. But I suddenly found that there was an abrupt departure from the statement that he was making. This is what I felt. So, I brought this to his notice. But it is

completely up to him.... *(Interruptions)* Moreover, when a precedent of this kind has already been cited.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: We agree, Sir; we are helpless. We abide by the... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Sir, I am quite clear in my mind as to what I want to say and I am quite clear in my mind that what I want to say is not, in any way, against the rules of procedure or against propriety. This is a country where accountability is the corner- stone of our democratic system. In spite of all this, Sir, since the suggestion is coming from the Chair that I should choose some other opportunity or some other occasion to say what I have to say, I will defer to the wishes of the Chair and do not say what I was going to say; and seek another opportunity to do so. But what I would like to say, however, is that this Government ... *(Interruptions)*...

श्री प्रमोद महाजन: आप बोलिए, सब सुनने के लिए बेताब हैं । अर्जुन सिंह जी, आप बोलिए, सारा हाउस सुनने के लिए बेताब है । आप सुना नहीं रहे हैं ।...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री अर्जुन सिंह : मैं प्रोवोक नहीं होता ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी) : वह प्रोवोक तो होते नहीं ।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : So long as you know that you are following the illustrious footsteps of late Shri Raj Narain ... *(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARJUN SINGH : Well, I do not know where many of you would have been, but for Shri Raj Narain. So, I do not want to follow anyone and I do not want to dispute or denigrate anyone. मर्यादा का पालन तो होना ही चाहिए और जब चेयर से कोई संकेत आए तो सर्वोच्च मर्यादा का पालन करने का सवाल है । But I will seek another occasion and I will seek the indulgence of the Chair when I seek that occasion. The unfortunate and the strange part is that this Government has introduced a new word in the political lexicon of this country, and that word is, "back burner". Anything which is inconvenient, contentious or coming in the way of some achievement or some objective, is put on the back burner, to be taken out at an appropriate moment, to be put on the front burner irrespective of the fact that it will set the country aflame, leading to untold misery of millions and vitiating the atmosphere of this nation. I do not subscribe to this back-burner and front-burner theory by

which your Government runs. This nation has already borne the burden of this theory of back-burner. Many of those with whom you have cobbled up together in a coalition, one day or the other, sometime today or tomorrow, would give voice to their feelings. But they are afraid to come to the front burner. Therefore, they let the back burner glow. Please do not burn the country between the back-burner and the front-burner. This is my appeal to you and I hope the hon. Finance Minister will give whatever assurances he thinks appropriate on the points that I have raised in the course of my discussion. Thank you very much.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री टी.एन. चतुर्वेदी) : नरेन्द्र मोहन जी । आपकी पार्टी के 48 मिनट हैं और चार लोग बोलने वाले हैं ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : मान्यवर, आपने कृपा की जो आपने समय का संकेत कर दिया । कांग्रेस पार्टी के 60 मिनट थे और 60 मिनट माननीय सदस्य बोल चुके हैं । अन्य व्यक्ति बोलेंगे या नहीं यह आपकी कृपा पर है । हमारी स्थिति क्या बनेगी यह भी आपकी कृपा पर निर्भर है ।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : आधा मिनट तो हो गया ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : महोदय, मैं यही प्रार्थना करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं कि मंत्री महोदय ने भारत की संचित निधि से 7 लाख 84 हजार करोड़ रुपया की मांग की है जिसकी स्वीकृति लोकसभा ने दे दी है और उन्होंने अनुरोध किया है कि राज्य सभा भी सर्वसम्मति से इसकी स्वीकृति दे । महोदय, इस बिल को लेकर मन में कोई मैल लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, इसके विरोध की आवश्यकता नहीं है ।

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri Rama Shanker Kaushik) in the Chair]

सरकार चलानी है और सफाई से चलानी है, पारदर्शिता से चलानी है, विकास के लिए चलानी है, समृद्धि के लिए चलानी है। हमने समृद्धि पाई है, पिछले दो वर्षों का इतिहास इस बात का साक्षी है। आर्थिक समीक्षा जिसकी चर्चा श्री अर्जुन सिंह जी ने की, वह इस बात की साक्षी है कि इस दौरान हमने प्रगति की है। यह आर्थिक समीक्षा यह नहीं बताती कि इस सरकार ने किसी क्षेत्र में प्रगति नहीं की है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं। मनमोहन सिंह जी जब वित्त मंत्री थे, उनके ऊपर बड़ा उत्तरदायित्व था देश को विकास के पथ पर लाने का। उनका स्वप्न क्या था? मैं उनका एक भाषण जो उन्होंने 1995-96 का बजट प्रस्तुत करते हुए दिया था, उनकी क्या प्राथमिकताएं थीं, वह पढ़ रहा हूं। आदरणीय मनमोहन सिंह जी ने

कहा था कि यदि हमारा लक्ष्य सात से आठ प्रतिशत आर्थिक वृद्धि हो जाए तो हमारे बढ़ते हुए श्रमिक बल को आवश्यक नौकरियां उपलब्ध करा सकता है और हमें विद्युत, सड़कों, पत्तनों, सिंचाई, रेलवे, दूरसंचार जैसी आधारभूत संरचना के प्रमुख क्षेत्र में और अधिक निवेश तथा कार्य क्षमता को बढ़ा सकता है। कब? यदि हमारा लक्ष्य सात से आठ प्रतिशत की आर्थिक प्रगति प्राप्त करना हो। यही तो गति लक्ष्य है हमारा जो सकल उत्पाद है उसकी विकास दर का। क्या हुआ है? अगर इसको देखने लगें, आर्थिक समीक्षा से यह बात स्पष्ट हो जाएगी कि हम कहां तक पहुंचे हैं। जो बजट प्रस्तुत किया गया या जो खर्च की अनुमति मांगी जा रही है, क्या यह देश को सात से आठ प्रतिशत की वृद्धि नहीं देगी? अर्जुन सिंह जी, यह दर विकास को गति देगी और दे रही है पिछले दिनों की है। यह कहना कि इसमें हमें दरिद्रनारायण की चिंता करनी चाहिये, दरिद्रनारायण की समग्र चिंता है इस बजट में। इस बजट में कृषि के लिए, दरिद्रनारायण के लिए जैसी व्यवस्था की गई है, जितना धन दिया गया है, उतना धन इस देश में इसके पहले किसी भी वित्त मंत्री ने नहीं दिया, किसी भी बजट में इतनी व्यवस्था नहीं की गई, इतनी अधिक किसी भी सरकार ने व्यवस्था नहीं की। किसी राजनीतिक दल को इतनी चिंता नहीं थी दरिद्रनारायण की जितनी इस बार के बजट में की गई है। आप देखें निर्धनता उन्मूलक कार्यक्रमों के लिए कार्यक्रम बनाए गए, कृषि क्षेत्र में 3623 करोड़ रुपये खर्च करने जा रहे हैं। क्या इतना खर्च इसके पहले कभी इस देश में हुआ? मैं और बताना चाहूंगा। ग्राम विकास के क्षेत्र में कहा जाता है कि यह बजट ग्रामीण क्षेत्र विकास के लिए नहीं है। जैसे कि संकेत दिया गया है, इस बजट में 7913 करोड़ रुपये केवल ग्रामीण विकास, सिंचाई के लिए मांगे जा रहे हैं, क्या यह कम है? कुल मिला कर 12000 करोड़ रुपये मांगे जा रहे हैं ताकि निर्धनता का उन्मूलन हो और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों का विकास हो, जो दरिद्रनारायण आप कह रहे हैं, उनकी समस्याओं का समाधान हो। यही तो हमारी आकांक्षा है। यह पहले नहीं हुआ। अब यह बात होने जा रही है। जब यह होने जा रही है तो उसका स्वागत करें। मान्यवर, मेरा आपसे विनम्र अनुरोध है। आप उसका स्वागत करें। आप देखें हमारे निर्धनों, विशेष रूप से ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के जो निर्धन हैं, किसान हैं, छोटे किसान है, उनको ऋण नहीं मिलता था। आप जानते हैं किस तरह से मिलता था। उस तरफ ऋण प्रवाह बने, किसानों के लिए ऐसी व्यवस्था करने की चेष्टा की है। इसके पहले 1992-93 में मात्र 15000 करोड़ रुपये ऋण प्रवाह हुआ करता था। 1994-95 में 19000 करोड़ होता था। अब 51500 करोड़ रुपये किया है, पहले मैं 28000 करोड़ कह गया था, मैं अपनी भूल सुधार कर रहा हूं, 515000 करोड़ रुपये जो कृषि के विकास के लिए ऋण प्रवाह के रूप में उपलब्ध रहेगा, इसके लिए यह पैसा आपसे मांगा जा रहा है।

लघु उद्योगों के विकास के लिए पैसा मांगा जा रहा है। कृषि में निवेश घटा है ऐसा अगर आपका विचार है तो यह विचार भी सही नहीं है। अब तो अर्जुन सिंह जी चले गए। अब बताइए मैं क्या बताऊं। उनके प्रश्नों का उत्तर मुझे तो देना ही है। लेकिन उनका आशीर्वाद रहेगा और मुझे विश्वास है कि सदन निश्चित रूप से जो धनराशि मांगी गयी है उसको स्वीकृत करेगा।

पर मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं। अर्जुन सिंह जी ने ठीक कहा कि जब संचित निधि से किसी बात पर धनराशि मांगी जाती है तो यह समीक्षा करने का समय होता है कि हमने पिछले वर्षों में क्या किया, क्या नहीं किया, कहां किया, कैसे किया। हमको बताया जाता है कि कहां हमसे कोई चूक हुई है। हमें कोई चूक नहीं बतायी गयी। बात की गयी संस्कृति की, बात की गयी साम्प्रदायिकता की; बात की गयी प्रधान मंत्री का दायित्व ऐसा है, बात की गयी आर एस एस की, पार्टी की - वित्त संबंधी चर्चा पर कोई बात नहीं हुई। तो कोई बात समझ में नहीं आयी। बात की गयी एक वित्त संबंधी चर्चा की कि बैंकों पर एन पी ए बढ़ा है। बैंकों पर एन पी ए बढ़ा है तो क्या इस सरकार ने ध्यान नहीं दिया? कितने बैंकों का एन पी ए कम हुआ है इसकी चर्चा होनी चाहिए थी और यह चर्चा कई बार हो चुकी है। बैंकों पर नियंत्रण - सवेरे भी जैसे चर्चा हुई थी कि यह रिजर्व बैंक के माध्यम से हो रहा है और उसमें संतोष व्यक्त किया जा चुका है। फिर उस पर बार बार आपत्ति क्यों उठायी जा रही है। कठिनाई यह है कि जब राजनीतिक द्वेष भाव बढ़ जाते हैं तब फिर समस्याएं अधिक उत्पन्न हो जाती हैं।

हमारी सरकार ने सर्वाधिक इस बार ध्यान दिया है ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के विकास की ओर। किसानों की ओर मंत्री महोदय ने विशेष रूप से ध्यान दिया है।

दूसरी सबसे बड़ी बात यह है जो यह कहा जा रहा था इसके पहले कि हमारे यहां जो किसान हैं उनके आवास की समस्या, झुग्गी झोंपड़ी की समस्या की व्यवस्था नहीं हो पा रही है। इस बजट में मैं आपको बताना चाहूंगा कि 25 लाख मकान गांवों में बनेंगे। 1710 करोड़ रुपए की व्यवस्था है। 12 लाख मकान और अधिक बनाए जाएंगे इंदिरा विकास योजना के तहत। इसके पहले कभी भी इतने मकान इस देश में ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में बनाने की व्यवस्था किसी भी बजट में नहीं हुई। इसी लिए मैं कहता हूं कि इसे आप सब अपना समर्थन दें। 25 लाख मकान किस वर्ष में बनाए गए? किस वित्त मंत्री ने कहा कि इतने अधिक लगभग 37 लाख मकान ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में बनेंगे? और इसके लिए धन की व्यवस्था की गयी है। किसने कहा? हमारे वित्त मंत्री ने कहा है। अतः हम आपसे अनुरोध करते हैं कि आप इसका समर्थन करें।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु : पिछली बार भी कागज पर बनाए गए थे।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : कागज में नहीं वास्तव में मकान बने हैं। अगर वास्तव में मकान नहीं बने हैं तो आप इसके बारे में बताइए। जो लोग अपने अपने क्षेत्रों में जाते हैं, ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जाते हैं वे जानते हैं। हो सकता है कुछ क्षेत्रों में गड़बड़ियां हों क्योंकि इसमें राज्य सरकारें बीच में आती हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि गड़बड़ियां नहीं हुई होंगी लेकिन वित्त मंत्री इस बात के लिए आपसे धन मांग रहे हैं। उनका जो उद्देश्य है उनकी जो इच्छा है क्या वह कोई अपवित्र है? उनकी ओर से तो पैसा बरबाद नहीं किया गया। फिर उनकी आलोचना क्यों?

अब आप देखिए सबसे बड़ी कठिनाई यह रही है कि पिछले वर्षों में आधारभूत ढांचा जो है उसकी उपेक्षा हुई। उस उपेक्षा की ओर ध्यान देने की बात इस बार हुई है। हमारी सरकार इस वर्ष संरचना और ढांचा जो बहुत जरूरी है उसको ठीक करने के लिए लगभग 70 हजार करोड़ रुपए खर्च करने जा रही है।

विद्युत में 29,793 करोड़, परिवहन के लिए 20,993 करोड़, संचार के लिए 19,455 करोड़। इसके अलावा सड़कें बनाने के लिए अलग व्यवस्था है। अगर ये मंत्रालय चलाने हैं जिनके लिए पैसा मांगा जा रहा है संचित निधि से तभी तो विकास कार्य होंगे। अगर विकास कार्य करने हैं तो ये केवल बातों से नहीं होंगे। इसके लिए हमें निश्चित रूप से कुछ ऐसे कदम उठाने होंगे जिनसे कि देश का अपना एक आत्मविश्वास जाग्रत हो।

राजनीतिक कारणों से हम देश के आत्मविश्वास को एक चोट पहुंचाते हैं, जब एक सही काम को हम रोकते हैं । सही काम को नहीं रोका जाना चाहिए । सही काम का समर्थन किया जाना चाहिए । बताया जाना चाहिए था कि नहीं, इस मद में धन कम खर्च करिए, इस मद में धन अधिक खर्च करिए । तब तो बात समझ में आती थी । लेकिन ऐसा तो कुछ नहीं कहा गया और अभी तक तो कम से कम नहीं कहा गया । इसीलिए लोक सभा ने उसको पारित किया है। लोक सभा ने जब उसको पारित किया तो उसको सोच-समझ कर पारित किया है । राज्य सभा का यह कर्त्तव्य हो जाता है, हम सब का कर्त्तव्य हो जाता है कि जब एक सही चीज़ सामने आई है तो उसको एक अच्छे मन से स्वीकार करें । उसको एक सही दिशा मान करके आगे ले चलें । यह राष्ट्र तब बनेगा, जब हम सब में 'संगच्छध्वं संवद्ध्वं संवो मनासि जानताम्' यह भाव रहेगा । जब एक ऐसा विचार, राष्ट्र के विकास के लिए एक ऐसा चिंतन, हमारा हो । राष्ट्र के विकास के लिए हम एक मार्ग पर चलें । संपूर्णता के साथ आगे बढ़ते चले जायें। बिना किसी मतभेद के, ऐसे मतभेद के जो कि राष्ट्र के मनोबल को गिराता हो । कहा यह जाता है कि इस बजट के कारण मुद्रा-स्फीति बढ़ गई, इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ गया । सच तो यह है कि पिछले दो वर्षों का मुद्रा-स्फीति का इतिहास देखिए,

वह सरकार के पक्ष में है । कौन नहीं जानता कि पहले कैसी-कैसी मुद्रा-स्फीति हुई है ? कांग्रेस के समय में 17 परसेंट, 16 परसेंट, 15 परसेंट की मुद्रा-स्फीति हुई है । उसके बाद 12 परसेंट, 11 परसेंट की आम मुद्रा-स्फीति हुई है । हमारे यहां जो वर्तमान स्थिति है वह अब बिल्कुल नियन्त्रण में है । लगभग 6 परसेंट की मुद्रा-स्फीति की स्थिति आज बनती जा रही है । जबकि एक समय तो जनवरी के महीने को आप देखें, तो दो प्रतिशत से भी नीचे मुद्रा स्फीति की दर पहुंच गई थी । औसत मुद्रा स्फीति साढे चार, पांच प्रतिशत के आस-पास आने वाली है और उसको ले करके इतनी हाय-तौबा है कि मूल्य बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं । मूल्य की जो स्थिति है वह पहले की अपेक्षा अधिक नियंत्रण में है ।

इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि संचित निधि में से जो धन की मांग की गई है उसे आप सब की स्वीकृति मिले ।...**(व्यवधान)**...

अब यह कहा जाता है कि सकल राष्ट्रीय उत्पाद की दर नहीं बढ़ी, जो कि बढ़नी चाहिए थी। अब प्रश्न यह है कि सकल राष्ट्रीय उत्पाद की दर कितनी होनी चाहिए । सकल राष्ट्रीय उत्पाद की दर जो बहुत समय पहले ज्यादा थी और आज कम है । यह क्यों हुई है, इस पर तमाम बहस होती रही है । उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आप जानते हैं कि कृषि और विशेष रूप से कृषि से जो उत्पादन होता है वह एक प्रमुख अंग होता है । अब पानी नहीं बरसा, अवर्षण हुआ और इसकी वजह से कृषि का उत्पादन नहीं हो सका, तो निश्चित रूप से उसका प्रभाव पड़ा है । मैं जानता हूं कि उसका प्रभाव पड़ा है । लेकिन उसके परिणामस्वरूप, आज अगर कृषि के क्षेत्र में मात्र एक प्रतिशत से भी कम विकास हुआ, तो उसमें सरकार का कोई दोष नहीं है । आज भी भारतवर्ष की कृषि मानसून पर निर्भर करती है । ...**(व्यवधान)**... यह दुर्भाग्य है । ऐसी स्थिति क्यों है ? क्योंकि 50 वर्षों में जो सरकारें रहीं उन्होंने आधारभूत ढांचे के लिए, जितना निवेश होना चाहिए था, उतना नहीं किया । अधिक नहरें नहीं बनीं, सिंचाई की अच्छी व्यवस्था नहीं हुई । आज जब उसकी व्यवस्था की जा रही है तो उसके लिए धन चाहिए । मैं तो वित्त मंत्री जी को बधाई दूंगा कि वह दृढ़ता से खड़े रहे और सब्सिडी के मामले में नहीं झुके। यह सब्सिडी क्या है ? सब्सिडी यह है कि जब लागत से भी कम मूल्य पर आप देते हैं और ओपन एंडेड सब्सिडी का क्या अर्थ होता है, जो अति निर्धन हैं उन तक सब्सिडी पहुंचाई जाए, तब तो बात समझ में आती है । कहीं भूकंप आया है, कहीं बाढ़ आई हुई है, कहीं बहुत सूखा पड़ा है, उनको बहुत कम मूल्य पर अनाज मिले । जो अति निर्धन हैं, उनको कम मूल्य पर अनाज मिले । यह बात तो समझ में आती है । लेकिन एक ओपन एंडेड सब्सिडी का क्या अर्थ बन जाता है । वह तो एक घातक स्थिति बनती है । उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह ओपन एंडेड सब्सिडी को रोकने का चिंतन जो हमारी सरकार का है,

हम चाहते हैं कि पूरे सदन का उसको समर्थन मिले । ओपन एंडेड सब्सिडी राष्ट्र के लिए घातक हो सकती है । इस पर चिदम्बरम् जी ने अपना एक डिसकशन पेपर प्रस्तुत किया था। अच्छा होता, यह सदन उस पर चर्चा करता ।

महोदय, उस पर कोई चर्चा नहीं हुई । मैं तो वित्त मंत्री जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा और उपसभाध्यक्ष जी आप से अनुरोध करूंगा कि सब्सिडी पर जो वह डिस्कसन पेपर था, उस पर आप चर्चा कराएं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : वह आप लिखकर भेज दीजिए ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : महोदय, आप आदेश कर देंगे तो वह हो जाएगी ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : आप लिखकर भेज देंगे तो जरूर होगी ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : आप ने कह दिया, तो नोट हो जाएगा और यह जरूर हो जाएगी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, अभी खुसरो कमेटी ने इस बारे में परीक्षण किया है और उस के अनुसार भारत में 1 लाख करोड़ रुपए से भी ज्यादा धन सब्सिडी के माध्यम से खर्च हो रहा है। अब इस सब्सिडी को कहीं तो रोकना होगा और अगर रोकना है तो उस के लिए कड़े कदम भी उठाने होंगे, लेकिन यह कोई नहीं कहता । हम लोग कहते हैं, हमारी सरकार कहती है कि समृद्धि और विकास तभी संभव होगा जब उस के पीछे एक सुदृढ़ राजनीतिक प्रतिबद्धता होगी। महोदय, हमारी राजनीतिक प्रतिबद्धता है, इसीलिए हम दृढ़ता के साथ खड़े रहे जब कि लोक सभा में कहा गया कि डीजल के बढ़े हुए दाम वापिस ले लो, फर्टीलाइजर के दाम वापिस ले लो और जो नारे लगाए गए व सदन के बाहर जो नाटक किया गया उस का हमारे ऊपर कोई असर नहीं पड़ा क्योंकि यही देश के हित में है ।

महोदय, दरिद्र नारायण की सेवा तो तभी होगी जब औद्योगिक विकास हो, आर्थिक विकास हो, अधिक अनाज का उपजान हो, समृद्धि लाए बिना निर्धनता दूर नहीं होगी । अगर निर्धनता दूर करनी है तो समृद्धि लानी होगी और यह संकल्पबद्धता हमारी सरकार ने दिखायी है। इसीलिए हम आप से कह रहे हैं कि संचित निधि से जो धन मांगा गया है, उसे बेहिचक दे दिया जाना चाहिए । उस में कोई ज्यादा बहस की आवश्यकता ही नहीं है।

उपसभासध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : कृपया समाप्त करें ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं एक छोटी सी बात कहकर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा । यह सरकार पिछले वर्षों में किन परिस्थितियों में काम करती रही है ? आप देखिए, पिछले वर्ष हम युद्ध से जूझते रहे, हम ने लड़ाई लड़ी और हजारों करोड़ रुपए का

बोझ आया, लेकिन हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था लड़खड़ाई नहीं बल्कि वह सुदृढ़ता के साथ आगे बढ़ती चली गयी। तो यह धन कहां से आएगा ? महोदय, यह लोग कहते हैं कि कर भी न लगाएं और सब्सिडी भी सब दे दीजिए । यद्यपि 22 हजार करोड़ रुपए से ज्यादा का खर्चा सब्सिडी में होने जा रहा है, लेकिन फिर भी इन्हें संतोष नहीं है । यह कहते हैं कि इसे और बढ़ा दीजिए, लेकिन कितनी बढ़ा दीजिए, यह नहीं बताते । तो कहां कटौती कर दें ? क्या डिफेंस में कटौती कर दें ? महोदय, दुनिया के जितने भी अच्छे देश हैं जिन में भारत भी शामिल है, उन से यह अपेक्षा की जाती है कि वे अपने जी.डी.पी. का 3 से 4 प्रतिशत खर्च प्रतिरक्षा पर करें । महोदय, पाकिस्तान तो अपने जी.डी.पी. का 7 प्रतिशत खर्च प्रतिरक्षा पर करता है, चीन लगभग 9 प्रतिशत करता है, लेकिन भारत 2.5 प्रतिशत से भी कम खर्च अपनी प्रतिरक्षा पर कर रहा है । अब यह धन कहां से आएगा ? यह धन तो आप ही देंगे, संसद देगी तभी तो प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय खर्च करेगा ।

महोदय, इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर की बात की जाती है । उस के संबंध में राकेश मोहन समिति की रपट आई है । वह जिन हजारों-लाखों करोड़ रुपए से इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर का ढांचा ठीक होने की बात करते हैं, तो वह धन कहां से आएगा और अगर इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर ठीक नहीं होगा तो विकास कैसे होगा ? अब रही बात डिफेंस की तो डिफेंस की स्थिति बहुत गंभीर है, यह सभी जानते हैं । हमारा देश चारों ओर से शत्रुओं से घिरा हुआ है । ऐसी स्थिति में डिफेंस के लिए जो धन मांगा गया है, वह उचित है । हम चाहते हैं कि उस के लिए आप की स्वीकृति हो जाय, मेरा आप से यही विनम्र अनुरोध है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : अब कृपया समाप्त करें । आप के दल के और भी माननीय सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं ।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन : एक मिनिट में समाप्त कर दूंगा । महोदय, आर्थिक समीक्षा में यह कहा गया है कि हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था एक ठहराव की स्थिति में आ गयी है । अर्जुन सिंह जी ने यह बात कही थी। महोदय, आर्थिक समीक्षा, 1999-2000 के पेज-3 से मैं पढ़ रहा हूं,

"There was a sharp upturn in GDP growth in 1998-99 which reversed the deceleration in growth seen in 1997-98. The GDP growth accelerated to 6.8 per cent in 1998-99, from 5 per cent to 6.8 per cent."

क्या यह स्टैगनेशन है ? इसे कैसे स्टैगनेशन कह दिया गया ? ऐसा लगता है कि आर्थिक समीक्षा पढ़े बिना ये लोग बात करने के आदी हो गए हैं । मैं अगर आर्थिक समीक्षा के पन्ने पढ़ना शुरू करूं तो आर्थिक समीक्षा बताती है कि पिछले दो वर्षों में देश ने आर्थिक क्षेत्र में बहुत प्रगति की है और उसके लिए मैं सरकार को और वित्त मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूं ।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं और आपको बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया ।

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I want to confine my speech only to the economic issues, not to the political issues, and within the economic issues, I will not refer to the issues which we are going to discuss tomorrow. Tomorrow, there will be a discussion on the Finance Bill. That will give us an opportunity to discuss issues like savings, investment, rate of growth, public finance policies and various taxes. So, all these things I am not going to discuss. When I criticise the Government, I am not going to criticise this particular Government; this should be clearly understood. I am taking into account the entire period, from 1991 onwards to this date. During this period of almost nine-and-a-half years, there have been various Governments--the Congress Government, the BJP Government, the United Front Government. My points are not meant for this particular Government. Whatever I say should be taken in the spirit that this is basically a critique of the various Government policies pursued since 1991.

Let me make another point, before I come to the economic issues. The Government has mentioned that there is a very high fiscal deficit. They have been unable to contain the fiscal deficit. Now the Government hopes that through its policies, it will be able to contain the fiscal deficit this year. Sir, every year, we find a difference between what the Government wishes to do and what actually happens. The fiscal deficit had exceeded the figure which was estimated in the Budget of last year, by one-and-a-half per cent. Although our Finance Minister is very keen to keep the fiscal deficit low, going by the same ratio between the actual Budget estimates and the revised estimates, I fear that the fiscal deficit will go up to 6.5 per cent. In this situation, nobody wants the fiscal deficit to go up. I also would not like the fiscal deficit to go up. The fiscal deficit can be controlled by two ways, one by reducing the expenditure, and another by increasing the income. My point is, while we try to see what the expenditure pattern is, we should keep in mind that there are two ways for reducing the fiscal deficit. One is to reduce the expenditure, and the other is to raise the income. My criticism is that the Government has not done enough to increase its income. Tomorrow, we will discuss the Finance Bill; we will discuss the issue in detail, but the major point that I am going to raise is, the Government

should try to explore various ways for raising the income, not for reducing the expenditure alone. When we look at the expenditure figures, that are given in the Budget, and also in the Appropriation Bill, I am afraid whether it is possible to reduce the expenditure because almost 92 per cent of the expenditure of the Government is consumed only by four items. Only four items consume 92 per cent of the Government expenditure, and, practically speaking, less than 10 per cent is spent on, what is called, development. Whatever we have in the kitty of the Government, whatever we spend through various Departments, that constitutes only a small amount, compared to the enormous amount of expenditure which is incurred on non-economic, not wasteful--I would not call it wasteful-- but non-Plan and non-development activities, which do not contribute to the growth of the economy. Sir, my fear is, unless these four items are controlled one way or the other, the expenditure, as a whole, cannot be controlled.

If you look at the Plan expenditure, the proportion of the total expenditure, there was a time many years ago, when roughly 40 per cent of the total expenditure was on development. Today, it is something like 26 per cent. In 1995, it was 30 per cent. I am not happy with 30 percent. But there was, at least, 30 per cent. Today, it is 26 per cent. Mr. Minister, may I get your full attention, please? Today, it is 26 per cent, which means that actually you are spending one-fourth on development by doing this kind of figure work. But the actual situation is worse than that. If you take three items, actually not four items, the interest payments, the defence expenditure, both capital and revenue--I am taking both into account--and the subsidy, the total amounts to, according to my estimates--please check, if you like, and correct me, if I am wrong--90 per cent of the Government expenditure. Out of the total budgeted expenditure of the country for the coming year, that is Rs.3,38,487 crores, these three items account for Rs.2,89,144 crores, that is, 85.42 per cent. If you add to it the defence capital expenditure, it amounts to 90 per cent. In the last year's Budget it was 92 per cent. Roughly speaking these three items, interest and principal repaid, subsidy paid and the defence expenditure together account for more than 90 per cent of the expenditure. For example, you take the interest repayment. It has been promised in 1991--it is a promise which remained unfulfilled--by the Government, "we would try to reduce the repayment of loans, the principal would be reduced and the interest would be reduced". What is the figure now? The interest repayment accounts for half of the

revenue receipts. Whatever earning you get in the form of taxes and other revenues, half of it immediately goes to repay interests. If you take the capital, the loan which you have taken, which you repaid, we find that out of the capital receipts of different taxes--they are given in the Budget - 92 per cent of the entire receipts goes to repay the principal. So, the interest repayment and principal repayment account for such a huge rise in the total expenditure. I find it in the defence also. Now, I entirely agree with Mr. Narendra Mohan that our defence should not be compromised. We should try to ensure that the expenditure on our defence capabilities is not compromised. But I am not sure whether, while maintaining this defence capabilities or improving them, we can reduce the defence expenditure. But there are hundreds of ways for doing it. For example, there was a recent incident of an Army ammunition dump going up in flames. There was a loss of Rs.2,000 crores. For example, recently in this House there was a discussion on defence procurements. There were allegations that the procurements were not done perfectly or properly and global tenders were not invited. A lot of Army ammunitions, Army equipment, are kept badly or badly maintained. They rot there. They don't go to the defence of the country. The benefits go to some contractors. But they do not go to the defence of the country. They don't help the defence of the country. We know about the kickbacks. There is a scope for diplomacy. There is a scope for economic arrangement. You look at the European Community and you think of how much animosity was there between England and Germany immediately after 1945. When I was in England in 1963, no British landlady would give a room to a German student.

Now, they have a common market where a German can go to England, buy land, do any job he wants, can even vote, can get into business whatever he likes. Why can't we do something like this? It does not mean that in Europe all the disputes have been settled. But through diplomacy, through economic policy, they have now reached a position where it is extremely difficult for the world to be helped and the army required to guard the border is no longer necessary. So, the defence expenditure has been reduced. The expenditure which otherwise would have been spent for defence is now being spent for the development of the country. What I am saying is this. While not compromising on defence capabilities, it is possible to reduce the defence expenditure. This is such a huge expenditure that something will have to be done to reduce it. Thirdly, what happens is

this. You cannot touch defence, you cannot touch repayments, because repayment is a legal contract. You cannot refuse to repay the loan which you have borrowed. Since you cannot touch repayment, you cannot touch defence, you touch only subsidy. This subsidy accounts for something like only 6% of the total Budget. Not 90%. Ninety per cent will take into account everything. So, the subsidy is only 6%. It is not a big amount, as compared to the other two components. Whatever asset is there, it is only the subsidy. I do not understand why should the subsidy be under attack? Why are other means not found to reduce the expenditure? If it is a question of principle, there is not a single country in the world which does not give subsidy. In England, they have something called CONCORD, the fastest aircraft, which can take you before time. You can start at eight o'clock in the morning from England and can reach America by seven o'clock, before time. But this Concord, which is a technological marvel is highly subsidised. The Channel Tunnel, a Tunnel underneath the sea, is also a technological marvel. But its operational expenses could not be met. Forget the expenditure which has been incurred to construct the Channel Tunnel. Even the operational expenses could not be met. As a consequence, it was also subsidised. If you see, America gives 40 billion dollars every year to the agriculturists. The number of agriculturists is very small. It is less than one crore. And what we give to our 60 or 70 crore agriculturists! It is not more than one million dollar. So if we go by subsidy, we give very little, as compared to the subsidy given by the rich countries in the world. The other thing is this. Recently, I had been to Andhra Pradesh. In Andhra Pradesh, I visited some drought-prone areas, the Mahboobnagar district and Ranga Reddy district. I met the villagers there. All of them said. Obviously, they were suffering from drought, but they were also suffering from high food prices. At one time, rice used to be sold at Rs.2/- per kg. there. Then it was raised to Rs.3.50/-. Now it has reached to Rs.5.50/-. So they are saying "we do not have sufficient income even to buy it." And the agricultural subsidy has been very severely reduced. If we look at the performance of agriculture, during the 90s, its performance has been the worst, as compared to other sectors of the economy. The reason being that agricultural subsidies have been withdrawn. Our growth rate during the 90s under the reforms process has been around 1.8%. Whereas it was around 3% in the 80's. I find from the Budget that our hon. Finance Minister has mentioned about various agricultural schemes. But if you ignore those

various old wine in new bottle, what do you see? Look at the allocations to agriculture; the allocation to agriculture has gone down. It has gone down from 10.96% to 9.83%. Even in this year's Budget, it has gone down. If you look at the departmental allocations, I can show you item by item, how various expenditures have been reduced, . And our Finance Minister has announced this as the millennium Budget. He has announced this as the Budget of the 21st century.

The Finance Minister said, "We are moving towards becoming a developed nation." I have read this somewhere. If he says, "We wish to become a developed nation; this is our target" it is all right. But he says, "We are moving towards becoming a developed nation." I don't know how he can make such a statement. We are one of the poorest countries in the world. Sir, I find that there is absolutely no change in the pattern of allocation in the Budget. The pattern of allocation in the Millennium Budget is the same as was done in the last year's budget. It is exactly the same. There are some decimal points here and there. So far as agriculture is concerned - I am taking it as a ratio of the total expenditure - last year the allocation was 3.13 per cent. This year the allocation is 3.08 per cent. So far as rural development is concerned, last year it was 7.83 per cent. This year it is 6.7 per cent. We can see that this year the actual allocation has remained more or less the same. There are some minor changes here and there. Actually, there has been a reduction in the expenditure. So far as these two areas are concerned, there has been a substantial decline in the expenditure made. Sir, the Budget speech is full of rhetoric. If you look at the actual figures, not at the Budget speech, you will find that despite the assurances given by the Minister at different places that the basic development indicators like education and health would be given priority, actually their priority has gone down. The expenditure on education has declined from 2.23 per cent in the Revised Budget to 1.9 per cent in the Proposed Budget. The expenditure on health and family welfare has been reduced from 0.94 per cent in the last year to 0.80 per cent this year. In this way, in many of the critical sectors of the economy where the Government should have maintained the subsidy, it has not been maintained. As my colleague, Shri Dipankar Mukherjee, said earlier, the manufacturers of fertilizer are given subsidy to the tune of Rs. 4,500 crores as concession so that they can reduce the fertilizer prices. Out of this amount, we find that the fertilizer companies have overdrawn Rs. 2,000 crores. What attempt has

5.00 P.M.

the Government made to recover this money? There is no attempt by the Government to recover this money from the fertilizer companies which have taken away this money. I find that there has been a tendency to justify the reduction in expenditure in terms of the need to balance the budget. That is the main justification given. The budget can be balanced by having more income or by having a more effective administration which I will touch later. We should try to reduce the expenditure on two items. Subsidy accounts for only six per cent of the total expenditure. It has been reduced from 8 per cent to six per cent. Rather than doing this, why should we not reduce the expenditure on the other two items which are much bigger items of expenditure which account for more than 90 per cent of the total expenditure? I would request the hon. Minister to look at the expenditure pattern again and do not replicate what other Ministers have done earlier. Actually this is the tendency. Whatever amount was spent earlier, the same amount is spent now. There are only a few changes, cosmetic changes, here and there. If you bring down everything to percentages, you will see that there is no change. Now people do not go by percentages. The Minister also does not speak in percentages. In his Budget speeches the Minister gives figures. The figures increase every year. He does not talk in percentages. When you bring down these figures to percentages, you will find that there is no change.

So, the talk of this Budget being a millennium Budget is a hoax. There is no millennium Budget; there is no 21st century Budget. It is all a hoax. Actually, it is a continuation of all the wrong things that had started from 1991, and whatever was wrong in the earlier Budgets have really been reinforced here. There has been no improvement in terms of expenditure policies, although the Government promised several years ago an Expenditure Commission. We are told that some work is being done by the Expenditure Commission. I do not know what work is being done by them. But there is no Expenditure Policy. There has to be a policy on expenditure which serves the interests of the common masses, the poor and the unemployed. We have a food reserve of more than 30 million tonnes. Why should not a part of the food reserve be given to the starving millions in the States of Gujarat, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh? I don't understand why it cannot be given to the suffering people. Why can't we, actually, ensure that at least the minimum basic need of food is satisfied by the Expenditure Policy? Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAMA SHANKER KAUSHIK): Dr. Raja Ramanna. Not present. Shri R. Margabandu. Not present. Shri R.P. Goenka.

SHRI R.P. GOENKA (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am aware what difficult tasks our Finance Minister had while presenting this Budget, while formulating this Budget. Even if it had been Dr. Manmohan Singh or Shri Pranabbabu, they would have had similar problems. So, I give my compliments that in spite of the problems, he did a good job. I don't see my dear friend who was defending the Finance Minister more than the Finance Minister himself. I feel that he was trying to rescue him out. But he did not know that this Finance Minister can rescue himself. He also said that from the Opposition, none has given constructive suggestions to the Finance Minister.

Sir, things have not gone as well as they should have. I would like to mention employment. In spite of the assurances that a minimum number of people will be given employment by the Government, we find that the percentage has gone up by 2.2, and there is a provision in this Budget also that a further increase to the extent of 28,900 would be made. On many earlier occasions, various Ministers of the Government, the Industries Minister, the Commerce Minister and the Finance Minister, have stated that employment would be not more, but less. I again feel that my dear friend is not present. Otherwise, I would have taken out from my file one or two examples for him.

There should have been some savings in the administrative expenses such as tribal affairs. The intention is good. I am not challenging that part. But there was no need to route the grants through the Ministry of Tribal Affairs since the grants are really made to the State Government. So, why was the grant not made to the State Government directly? This could have saved many crores of rupees.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : यहां कई बार कहा जा चुका है कि माननीय सदस्यगण अपने मोबाईल टेलीफोन घर पर रखकर आया करें या बाहर जमा करा दिया करें!

श्री आर.पी.गोयंका : चेयरमैन साहब, आपने जब कहा कि कई बार कहा गया तो मैंने समझा कि शायद मैं भी कोई कंट्रोवर्शियल प्वाइंट बोल गया हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : नहीं, नहीं, मैंने मोबाईल फोन के बारे में कहा।

SHRI R. P. GOENKA: Sir, there is another provision of giving grants to different organisations and different individuals who are needy.

जैसे अब सेंट्रल वाटर वर्क्स को देखिए । सेंट्रल वाटर वर्क्स में होता क्या है कि पैसा उठा कर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को दे दिया जाता है । एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट करती है लेकिन इस चक्कर में करोड़ों रुपए का खर्चा हो जाता है ।

महोदय, लास्ट प्वाइंट है और मैं देख रहा हूं कि हमारे सीनियर साथी काफी कुछ बोल चुके हैं कि एक साल में एक दफा सारे खर्चे का असेसमेंट होता है, उसका ब्यौरा लिया जाता है और उस पर कार्यवाही करने की अगर आवश्यकता हो तो कार्यवाही की जाती है । मैं यह कहूंगा कि अगर छः महीने में इसकी समीक्षा हो तो इससे सबका भला होगा । इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए कहूंगा कि मेरे पास वह अथॉरिटी तो नहीं है कि मैं कह सकूं कि वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो सुझाव दिए हैं, उनको हम स्वीकार करते हैं लेकिन अगर मुझसे पूछा जाए तो मैं कहूंगा कि उन्होंने बहुत अच्छा काम किया है, धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAMA SHANKER KAUSHIK) : Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy. He is not present. Shri S. Viduthalai Virumbi.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 2000. Sir, when we go through the Budget, there are some items that can be appreciated by all sections of the society. For example, the small-scale industries sector is a sector which contributes more than 35 per cent of our export income. Collateral requirement has been raised from Rs. one lakh to Rs. five lakhs. This is to be appreciated. Sir, since the time is very limited, I will come to the subject of income- tax exemption directly. Every year, when the Finance Minister announces something, people are very eager to know how they will be benefited. In this august House, in 1995, I said that there was a policy in Australia whereby, first, they fix the basic exemption for income-tax, after consulting the employers, employees and the Government.

After the three sectors have come together and fixed some basic exemption limit for Income-tax, then, whatever inflation may take place in a particular fiscal year, that percentage can be automatically added by the

Income-tax Commissioner. So, they need not expect any announcement in the Budget. If this policy is adopted in India also, I feel it will be a permanent solution of the Income-tax exemption issue. I appeal to the hon. Finance Minister to go through this aspect. If the basic Income-tax exemption is fixed after consulting the employees and the employers like it is done in Australia, then, people need not wait for an announcement by the Finance Minister; it will be a permanent solution. I hope the Finance Minister will heed to this request. The headache of all the Finance Ministers in the future also would be reduced.

Regarding the taxation policy, there are some doubts that I wanted to raise here. There was an article, 'Indirect Taxes - Proclaimed Reforms Not Carried Out', written by one, Mr. Sukumar Mukhopadhyay which appeared in the Economic and Political Weekly. It says and I quote, "There is only a single rate of CENVAT." That is, last year there were six, namely 8, 16, 24, 30, 32 and 40. This year they are 8, 16, 24, 32 and 40. The only rate that has evaporated is 30. So, in all fairness to the manufacturers and the people at large, the Finance Minister should have said that the effective rates have been reduced to five from six. It is factually wrong to say as he has done, that there is only a single rate of CENVAT, that is, 16. In paragraph 74 of the Budget, the Finance Minister says, "I propose to convert these three, 8, 16 and 24 *ad valorum* rates to a single rate of 16 percent CENVAT". Later in para 80, he says that the three special excise rates will not generally be modvatable, that is, users will not be able to avail of modvat credit of these duties. Unfortunately, this is factually wrong. The new rule, 57(b) for CENVAT credit allows it for the first and the second schedule, both. The second schedule is for special excise duty and covers such items as white cement, special boiling point spirits, high tenacity yarn of polysters, other yarns, air-conditioning machines, chassis for motor vehicles, etc. which are intermediate products and will get cenvat that credit. In any case, all the items in the second schedule are modvatable according to the rule and, so, it goes directly against para 80 of the Budget speech. What para 80 says, that special excise duties are not generally modvatable, is not at all clear. If it means that some of the items are finished goods and so are not, in effect, amenable to the modvat credit, then the same is true also for the goods in the first schedule. Again, if the special excise duties were not modvatable, then what has been claimed in para 84, that the burden of duty of 24 per cent would remain the same, would not be true. So, in effect, it is clear that the

speech and the rule are at loggerheads. When the hon. Minister replies, he should clear the doubts lingering in the minds of the people.

Regarding fertiliser, we feel that the manufacturers are getting more profit than the users of fertilisers, that is, the agriculturists. That is the general feeling. Therefore, regarding the subsidy issue, I want to say that subsidy is not a dole or a donation offered to the poor by the rich people. Subsidy is nothing but transfer of income from one section of the society to the other section. Jaswant Singhji, when he was replying on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, assured us that he would inform the Cabinet the concerns expressed in this august House with regard to the subsidy aspect on fertilizer and PDS items. I remind the Finance Minister once again to take care of the people who are not only living below the poverty line, but also the people above the poverty line. In legal parlance, people may be above the poverty line, but in practical life, middle-class and lower-middle-class people are living in poverty. Therefore, the Government should consider this issue. I once again request Government to look into the subsidy on fertilizers and PDS items. They should, at least, restore the status *quo ante*. I would once again request the Government on this.

As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, we are bearing more than Rs. 1300 crore burden, whereas the other States are different. For above-the-poverty line people, in Andhra Pradesh, rice is sold at Rs. 12.40; in Kerala it is Rs.12.40; in Karnataka, it is Rs.12.75; in West Bengal, it is Rs.13.95. As far as Tamil Nadu is concerned, for below-the-poverty-line and also above-the-poverty- line, for both, we are supplying 20 kgs. of super fine quality rice at the rate of Rs. 3.50 per kilo. You should see to it that this benefits the agriculturists.

As far as textiles are concerned, previously, the effective excise duty for yarn was 5.75%. In the last Budget, it was enhanced to 8%. The effective excise duty, adding additional duty, on yarn is 9.2%. Therefore, I request the hon. Finance Minister to see to it that the excise duty is reduced to 3 or 4%. If it is not possible, at least, go back to the status *quo ante*, that is, 5.75% before last year.

For textile mills' upgradation, you have announced Rs. 25,000 crores. But in practice, the people who are applying for bank loans, are experiencing some difficulty because banks are insisting that only those mills which are able to show profits in their balancesheet for three consecutive years would

be able to avail of this benefit. I want to know whether this norm has been fixed by the Government or by the banks themselves. The Government should look into this aspect. The Textile Upgradation Fund is actually earmarked to see that the textiles sector comes up. If the banks insist that three consecutive years' profit is a must, then 90% of the mills can't avail of the fund earmarked for this purpose. Therefore, practically, we are not going to help the mills. I request the Government to see to it that this condition is removed.

I now come to water pumps. Forty per cent of the water pumps are manufactured in Coimbatore. Of the demand all over the country, the Coimbatore water pump manufacturers meet 40% of the demand. What is the difficulty now? For water pumps, the customs duty is 32%. But the excise duty on the raw material required to manufacture water pumps works out to more than 60%. Why I want to emphasise this particular point is, the custom duty on the raw material is 67%, but the customs duty on imported water pumps is only 32%. It means, import of water pumps will increase. In that case, the indigenous manufacturers suffer like anything. I would just tell you what are the raw materials required for the manufacture of water pumps.

Sir, the raw materials required for manufacturing water pumps are copper rod, gunmetal, SS sheets, polypropylene, C.R. electrical coils, etc. The customs duty on these items is 66.86 per cent. If a water pump alone is imported, then the custom duty is only 32.60 per cent. This anomaly will help only China and not India. If it continues for two or three years, the entire Indian water pump market will be occupied by China and the Indian manufacturers will be affected automatically. Sir, I will take another two minutes. Sir, the actual customs duty on the raw material is 67.86 per cent. This is the second point that I wanted to raise.

Sir, then I come to the 1/6 Scheme. In this connection, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what is the incremental income or the incremental revenue that he has got through this 1/6th Scheme. I would also like to know the cost incurred by the Income-Tax Department on collecting this amount. I would like to know whether this scheme is profitable or not. If it is not profitable, then it should be scrapped. If you find that it is profitable then what I would suggest is that you increase the strength of the Income-Tax Department. Otherwise, you will be putting

further burden on the staff of this Department. You should increase the strength of the Income-Tax Department so that the burden on the staff is reduced.

The last point that I want to mention is with regard to the poverty alleviation programme. Some States are very efficiently implementing this programme. But, I would tell you, Sir, how it affects them. If under the poverty alleviation programme the line of poverty is lowered, then what they get from the Central Government as allocation is also reduced further. I would like to quote the Budget of Tamil Nadu here. It states that States like Tamil Nadu have been successfully implementing the various schemes for economic development and poverty alleviation. We have urged the 11th Finance Commission and the Union Planning Commission that the Union Government should instead of reducing allocation for various schemes for these States give additional resources to these States.

I hope the Government will pay attention to the points that I have raised. I expect a favourable and positive reply from the Finance Minister.

श्री ललितभाई मेहता (गुजरात): उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, विनियोग विधेयक पर चल रही चर्चा में आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए शुक्रिया । मैं इस संबंध में कुछ तथ्य सदन के सामने रखना चाहूंगा।

महोदय, 1991 से हमने जो आर्थिक उदारीकरण, वैश्वीकरण और खानगीकरण की नीति अपनाई, उसके जो परिणाम सामने आए हैं, उनको ध्यान में रखते हुए इस बजट में वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो प्रावधान किए हैं, वे सराहनीय हैं और सही दिशा में ले जाने वाले हैं । फिर भी मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि 1981 से 1991 के दशक में हमारे औद्योगिक विकास की दर 7.7 प्रतिशत थी जो 1991 से 1999 तक के जो हमारे 9 साल रहे, उसमें यह घटकर 5.8 प्रतिशत पर आ गई है । हमारा विदेशी विनिवेश जो यहां पर होने वाला था, हमने जो कल्पना की थीं वह यह थी कि हर साल 43 हजार करोड़ रुपये की पूंजी डाइरेक्ट इन्वेस्टमेंट में आएगी ।

लेकिन चित्र यह है कि इन 9 सालों में जो 90 बिलियन डालर यहां पर आने चाहियें थे, उसके बजाय इन 9 सालों में सिर्फ 13 बिलियन डालर ला पाए हैं । यह हमें जानना होगा कि हमारी जो उदारीकरण की नीति थी, जो विदेशी निवेश हम यहां पर लाना चाहते थे, यह हम क्यों नहीं ला सके ? हमारे मित्र ने अभी उल्लेख किया था कि 1981-91 के दशक में हमारी कृषि के विकास की दर 4.04 प्रतिशत थी जो घट कर के इन दो सालों में

2.3 प्रतिशत ही रह गई है । इसका क्या कारण है ? मुझे लगता है कि खेती के क्षेत्र में जो संसाधन हमें जुटाने चाहियें थे, जो कुदरती संसाधनों को आधार बना कर हम चलते हैं, उनके बजाय हमें पूरा इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर कृषि के लिए बनाना था, वह हम नहीं बना पाए, इसलिए हमारी यह परिस्थिति हुई । दूसरी ओर यह परिस्थिति रही कि 1991 में जमीन पर निर्भर रह कर आजीविका पाने वाले लोगों की संख्या हमारे देश में जो 186.2 मिलियन थी, वह बढ़ कर के अब 228.2 मिलियन 1999 में हो गई अर्थात् कृषि पर निर्भर रहने वाले लोग बढ़ गये । हम चाहते थे कि इस दशक में उदारीकरण और वैश्वीकरण के आधार पर हम औद्योगिक विकास करें, सर्विसेज़ सेक्टर का विकास करें लेकिन हमारे देश में कृषि पर निर्भर रहने वाले लोग ज्यादा बढ़ गये। इसके कारण आर्थिक क्षेत्र में हमारे विकास की दर के साथ लोगों की आमदनी बढ़नी चाहिये थी, वेज का ग्रोथ रेट बढ़ना चाहिये था, वह 1981-91 के दशक में 4.6 प्रतिशत था, वह आज घट कर के इन दो सालों में 2.5 प्रतिशत पर आ गया है । हमारा जो भावांक 1981-91 के दशक में 6.9 प्रतिशत से बढ़ा था, 9 सालों में 8.8 प्रतिशत से बढ़ा है। हमारे इम्पोर्ट 1981-91 में 4.5 प्रतिशत से बढ़े थे, 1991-99 में 7.97 प्रतिशत से बढ़े हैं। एक्सपोर्ट भी हम ज्यादा नहीं कर पाए, ऐसी परिस्थिति का हमें आंकड़ों से पता चलता है । 1981-91 के दशक में जो 8.28 प्रतिशत थे, वह इन 9 सालों में 8.41 प्रतिशत तक ही रह गये । इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि 1981 में जो परिस्थिति थी, हमारा जो ट्रेड डेफिसिट था, वह 5838 करोड़ रुपये था, 1990-91 में यह बढ़ कर 10465 करोड़ रुपये हुआ था लेकिन जो 9 साल हुए 1991 से 99 में 1998-99 में जो हमारा ट्रेड डेफिसिट रहा 55478 करोड़ रहा । हमारी फॉरेन ट्रेड पॉलिसी जो कंसिस्टेंटली तय होनी चाहिये थी, वह तय हुई या नहीं हुई, इस पर हमें सोचना पड़ेगा । कुल विदेश व्यापार में हमारा हिस्सा आधा प्रतिशत से भी कम रहता है, इस बात को भी हमें सोचना होगा । यह जो परिस्थिति है, इसके आधार पर और इस बजट में जो प्रावधान किये गये हैं, मैं उसके आधार पर सुझाव रखना चाहूंगा । इस बजट में हमने 51500 करोड़ रुपया कृषि के क्षेत्र में ऋण के लिए देना तय किया है लेकिन किसान को जो ऋण मिलता है, वह ऋण 13 परसेंट, 14 परसेंट, 15 परसेंट ब्याज से मिलता है । हमारा नाबार्ड 5-6 प्रतिशत से ऋण देता है लेकिन नाबार्ड स्टेट कोआप्रेटिव बैंक्स को देता है, स्टेट कोआप्रेटिव बैंक्स डिस्ट्रिक्ट कोआप्रेटिव बैंक्स को देते हैं और डिस्ट्रिक्ट कोआप्रेटिव बैंक्स किसान की मंडली को देते हैं । जो बिचौलिया एजेंसीज़ हैं, इनके कारण किसान को जो ऋण मिलता है, वह महंगा मिलता है । इस पर सोचना होगा। मेरा यह सुझाव रहेगा। दूसरी यह बात है कि कृषि के क्षेत्र में हमारी जो विकास की दर कम हुई है उसका एक मात्र कारण यह है कि पानी और खाद की उपलब्धि जो हमारे यहां होनी चाहिए वह नहीं हुई। मैं एक कंक्रीट उदाहरण एकाध मिनट में

आपके सामने रखना चाहूंगा। मैं जहां से आता हूं वहां पर एक हेक्टेयर जमीन में खेत में जो कपास का बीज बोया जाता है और उससे जो कपास का उत्पादन होता है उस पर 6 हजार रुपए की लागत आती है। गत साल गुजरात में बारिश अच्छी थी। जितना पानी आना चाहिए था उतना ही आया और जब आना चाहिए था उसी वक्त आया इसके कारण एक हेक्टेयर जमीन में 50-51 मन कपास उत्पन्न हुई और करीब 26-28 हजार रुपए की किसान को बचत हुई। अब वही खेत है, वही बीज, वही खाद और वही दवाइयां, वही जमीन लेकिन इस बार गुजरात में बारिश नहीं हुई इसके कारण एक हेक्टेयर जमीन में जो किसान ने 6 हजार रुपए का निवेश किया था तो उसको 3 हजार रुपए की उपज भी इस साल नहीं मिली। कारण यही है कि पानी नहीं आया और जितना पानी चाहिए था उतना नहीं आया।

खेती के क्षेत्र में इस बात पर ध्यान देना चाहिए कि जब पूरी बारिश हमारे देश में होती है तो क्यों नहीं यह सोचा जाए कि सारे देश के जो सभी जिलों के केंद्र हैं वहां पीने का पानी और सिंचाई का पानी उपलब्ध कराने के लिए उनको पाइप लाइन से जोड़ दिया जाए जिससे सभी जगहों पर जहां पानी की आवश्यकता है वहां पानी इस पाइप लाइन से मिल जाए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) :माननीय मेहता जी कृपया समाप्त करें।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, 6 बजे तक समाप्त कर दें। थोड़ा-थोड़ा बुलवा दें और मंत्री जी जवाब दे दें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : मैं तो वही कह रहा हूं। अब आप एक मिनट में समाप्त कर दें मेहता साहब।

श्री ललितभाई मेहता : मेरे केवल 3-4 छोटे छोटे सुझाव हैं।

हमारे पास जो पशुधन है इसका उपयोग हम सही तरीके से नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। इसके कारण हमारे देश में जो सम्पत्ति बढ़नी चाहिए वह नहीं बढ़ रही है। हमारा 26 करोड़ का पशुधन है। यह अनुमान किया गया है कि अगर 5-6 करोड़ के पशुधन का हम उपयोग करेंगे तो उसके ऊपर जो आने वाली लागत है, एक बार में जो कैपिटल इन्वेस्टमेंट उसके ऊपर लगेगा वह पूरे एक साल में हमें मिल जाएगा और दूसरे साल से हमको रेवेन्यू, इन्कम मिलनी शुरू हो जाती है। हमारे कई मित्रों ने प्रयोग किए हैं। ये प्रयोग यह बताते हैं कि अगर हम 5 प्रतिशत के पशुधन का सही तरीके से प्रयोग करेंगे तो 75 हजार करोड़ रुपए उससे एक साल में हमको आमदनी मिल सकती है। दूसरी ओर हमारी यह परिस्थिति है कि हम पशुओं को कत्लखानों में भेज रहे हैं। उसके मांस का निर्यात बढ़ रहा है। उस एक हजार करोड़ के

मांस के निर्यात के लिए हम एक्सपोर्ट में सब्सिडी दे रहे हैं। यह सब बंद करके पशुधन का हम सही इस्तेमाल करें और उससे आमदनी ले सकें, हमें यह प्रयत्न करना चाहिए।

प्रदूषण की बात है। जो बड़े बड़े शहर हैं वहां पर सारे उद्योग लगाए जाते हैं। मेरा यह सुझाव रहेगा कि जो हमारे देश के 12 बड़े शहर हैं उन सब जगह पर जो इंडस्ट्रियल इन्वेस्टमेंट करने आएं तो उनसे इन्वायरनमेंट के लिए स्पेशल सेस लिया जाए। क्या हम ऐसा कोई प्रयत्न कर सकते हैं, इसके बारे में हमें सोचना चाहिए।

अभी हमारे पास एक्सेस फूड स्टाक है। एक बार मैंने यह पढ़ा कि हमारे पास जो गेहूं और चावल का एक्सेस फूड स्टाक है उसको ध्यान में रखते हुए अगर हम उसका कोई डिस्पोजल करें तो 4,110 करोड़ रुपए हम किराए के बचा सकते हैं। इसके लिए भी विचार करना चाहिए और हमारे जो फारेन एक्सचेंज के रिजर्व हैं उसमें से थोड़ी सी राशि हम इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर के लिए उपयोग कर सकते हैं कि नहीं, इस पर भी हमें विचार करना चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : समाप्त करें। श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिआ - नहीं हैं। माननीय ब्रह्मकुमार भट्ट जी।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : आप तो सूक्ष्म में अपनी बात कह दें।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : गागर में सागर भर देते हैं।

SHRI BRAHMAKUMAR BHATT (Gujarat) : Sir, I would restrict myself to only one point, that is, disparity and poverty. More than seven crore people are living below the poverty line in the urban areas. They are living in conditions that are even worse than those of the rural poor. Only yesterday, in Delhi, a man who was unemployed, who had lost his job, poisoned his wife and his four children and then hanged himself. This is the latest example of this city where more than one crore people are living. Sir, six members of a family committed suicide. The reason was that there was no job, no income. They were starving. This is the condition of the urban poor. The condition of the rural poor is still worse. The experts differ. The Lakdawala Committee differs with the research made by the NCAER. A reply was given to me on 27.04.2000, in response to my question, "Whether it is a fact that differences prevail amongst the research organisations about the percentage of persons living below the poverty line in India", the Government said, "Yes". The next part of my question was, "Whether it is a fact that the NCAER and Lakdawala Committee figures on

2277/RS/2000-15

people living below the poverty line differ", and the reply again was, "Yes". Sir, what I want to say is that the Government is not sure about the actual figure of the people living below the poverty line. This is the condition in this country. Therefore, what I submit is that in such a stark poverty, the difficulty is that the disparity is growing. If there is a reduction in poverty, we can understand. But the experts differ. The Government is not sure as to what is the actual figure of people living below the poverty line. Sir, the report of the NCAER is very much alarming. It says, "39% of the rural population is below the poverty line; while the mean household income in rural India works out to less than Rs. 1,900 per month, corresponding to a *per capita* income of Rs. 4,485. High income States have high income disparities. The low income States cover more than 50 per cent of India's population." Sir, the alarming point is, "About 58% of India's rural population has access to only about Rs. 6 per day to meet all their minimum requirements of health, nutrition, education and other essentials." We are paying Rs. 5 for a glass of juice in the Central Hall here, and Rs. 6 is the per day income of the poor people, and in only six rupees, they have to meet all these requirements. Sir, the report further says, "The total household expenditure on elementary schooling has been Rs. 368 per student per year. The NCAER has suggested that to impart elementary education to all children in India at the prevailing level of quality would involve an expenditure of Rs. 23,634 crores which is around 3.3 per cent of the gross domestic product. The current expenditure is only 1.7 per cent of G.D.P." Sir, these are the figures which show that in spite of the nine Five-Year-Plans, the status of the poor is very low in this country. When somebody referred to Darirdnaranayan, there was a criticism from the other side. Sir, the R.S.S. Chief Shri Sudarshanji has recently advised the Government; what he said in the R.S.S. Nagpur Camp has appeared in the Press also. He said, "Entrust the economic policy and economic line to Gandhian economists" He said, "Entrust it to Gandhian economists and whatever they suggest, implement it". This is what the R.S.S. Chief has said and this is what the leaders in the past have said. Sir, persons like Jayaprakash Narayanji and other people from the State of Bihar from where the Finance Minister comes, have said similar things. I can name so many people - people like Shri Gangasaran Sinha or Karpoori Thakur, etc. The R.S.S. Chief has said, "Go on Gandhian lines". But I am sure this is not going to be the case, so far as the present Government is concerned. Sir, we

know eliminating poverty is not a joke. But there should be a concrete line on the part of the Government. The stress should be on the elimination of poverty. The stress should be on the reduction in disparity, but the disparity is increasing; and if the disparity increases like this, the problem will be multiplied. Sir, the figure is very much alarming.The United Nations Development Programme has said that the actual number of poor who are still in the poverty trap, is around 554 billion. If this figure is correct, it means that more than 50 per cent of the people in this country are living below the poverty-line. In these circumstances, I request the hon. Finance Minister to allocate more and more for the persons who are living in this condition, whether they are living in the rural area or they are living in the urban area.

According to the latest Exim Policy, 754 items are coming into this country. There is a free import of everything. The milkman of India, Dr. Kurien, Chief of the Anand Dairy, has said, "We will have to consume milk of Denmark, and our cows will go to slaughter houses." This is what he has said. Instead of going on the Gandhian line, as suggested by the RSS Chief, we are going on a different line that exactly contradicts this.

What will happen to the people in the villages? What will happen to *kumhars, lohars* etc., all those people who are working and living in villages on these household things?

If everything is coming from outside, what will happen to them? The list is here. It is a very exhaustive list. I need not read it out. Everybody knows this. If these things are going to come, what will happen to the poor people? This requires to be very much considered.

Then, Sir, one more point that I want to mention here is that the interest rate has been reduced, and it being reduced gradually from day to day. What about pensioners? What about the persons who have retired and put their money in deposits with the Government? From 14 per cent or 15 per cent, the interest rate has come down to 11 per cent or 10.5 per cent. On the other hand, the prices are increasing. The prices of the PDS commodities have increased. The price of the LPG has increased. The price of kerosene has increased. The price of diesel has increased. On the one hand, the prices of these items are increasing, and, on the other hand, the interest rate is going down. What will happen to the pensioners who live only on their pension and the interest they earn on their deposits? What is

going to be the condition of those people? I say, Sir, that this is also the responsibility of the Government.

I know that I do not have much time. But, I submit that some of us feel that the democratic set-up in this country is being maintained by highly educated people, by parliamentarians and by political parties. Some of us think that the political set-up or the democratic set-up in this country is existing because of them. But, Sir, the democratic system in this country is not existing because of them: it is existing because of the ignorance of the poor people of this country. What will happen the day when they realise that injustice is being done to them, that they are being exploited and that the educated people who talk in the name of democracy, do not know their problems? Sir, by quoting a couplet of the well known poet of Gujarat, Uma Shankar Joshi, who was the winner of the Gyanpeeth Award, I will finish. We have to remember this. He was saying this for several years. He was staying in an *adivasi area.* He was himself coming from a very poor Brahmin family.

He was staying in an Adivasi area in the Sabarkantha district of Gujarat. In Gujarati couplet he said something which means in Hindi भूखे जनों में जिस दिन जागृति जागेगी, तब आपकी यह समाज व्यवस्था जो खंडहर हो चुकी है, उसका एक कण, एक पार्टिकल भी हाथ में नहीं आएगा ।

That is what the poet had warned. Let us realise the position. Thank you.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala): At a meeting in Bangkok held under the auspices of A.D.B., the Finance Minister had proudly claimed that the Budget which had cut certain subsidies had been passed in the Lok Sabha. He had also claimed that even though the N.D.A.partners, constituents of the Government, had certain reservations, had agreed to the cut. I earnestly appeal to the hon. Finance Minister and the Government as a whole, to reconsider its stand and withdraw the cut. While giving concessions to the corporate sector, the business class and the moneyed people, the Government has been putting more and more burden on the poor. The greatest attack on the pocket of the poor is by way of cut in subsidies. Initially they increased the prices of foodgrains -- wheat and rice - distributed through the P.D.S. Then they increased the price of L.P.G., kerosene. Even the prices of sugar have been increased. The net burden on

the common man and his family is Rs.200 per month. This has happened at a time when the Government claims an increase in industrial production, but, in fact, lakhs of workers have been thrown out of employment. During the last one year near about two lakh workers from the public sector and one lakh from the private sector have been thrown out of employment. New employment opportunities have not been generated. If you look at the rural scene, you will find that prices of various commodities produced by the peasants have fallen down. This is besides the natural calamities which have taken place in different areas. As a result, people in the rural sector are finding it hard to make their both ends meet. At such a time, a cut in subsidy is nothing but the greatest crime committed by the Government on the ordinary masses of the country. Therefore, I repeat my appeal that the cut in subsidies be withdrawn.

Secondly, even though the Finance Minister has been claiming that our economy has turned the corner and is moving forward, he also admits that the financial deficit is at a very disturbing level. At the same time, he agrees that the financial deficit is very high and at a very disturbing level. Not only the Finance Minister and the Government say this. The World Bank, the IMF, the multinationals, the leaders of the various developed capitalist countries, all those people, are saying that the financial deficit of this country is one of the serious problems that the country is facing and somehow or other, that will have to be reduced. Well, the Government is saying that it is taking very conscious steps to reduce it. One of the measures is to reduce the expenditure of the Government. According to me, the Government is not at all serious in reducing the Government expenditure, by its own conduct. A few days back, a Government officer himself told me that the Jumbo Government has the biggest Ministry. Every Minister means, he will have to be paid the salary, perquisites; then, he will have certain paraphernalia and certain staff and so many things are required. A large amount of expenditure is incurred. How can the Government, when they themselves form a Jumbo Cabinet, spending huge amounts on themselves, ask the ordinary people to cut short their demands? They cannot. Not only that. In this Budget, say, for Defence, it is the biggest ever increase that is offered through the Budget, about 28.2 per cent or so. The country is facing various difficulties. Our security is very important. We will have to safeguard our security, our independence, our borders, everything. We do agree. And, for that, our military or armed forces will

have to be properly equipped. There is no doubt about it. But, Sir, what is the record? From 1950 onwards, to this date, in the Defence Department, a substantial percentage of whatever amounts are allotted in the Budget, year after year, is not being expended. Not only it is not expended, it is not surrendered at the proper time. They are not only surrendering it, but, at the end, they say it is 'savings'. 'Savings' means unspent money. A lot of amounts that are being provided in the Budget are not utilized by the armed forces. That is one side. The other side is this. In the last Session, a very serious discussion took place in our own House. Mr. Jayant Malhoutra raised a very particular issue regarding the purchase of armaments. He raised certain allegations and the matter was discussed here. He submitted a document also. In that, it was stated that more than Rs.50,000/- crore worth of material, armaments and other things, which could not be used at all, which were obsolete or quality-wise not usable, had been purchased and stocked in various godowns. They were worth more than Rs.50,000 crores. Then, in the last week, we discussed the fire that occurred in an armament depot. What is the situation there also? Whatever armaments were purchased are not being properly kept and safeguarded. That is another position. If a huge amount is being allotted for Defence, how can it be usefully spent by the armed forces? Therefore, at one stretch, if you increase this by 28.2 per cent, can it be utilized properly? That is also another matter to be considered.

The third point I would like to make is, you have to realize the money due. Even in the case of revenue income, there are arrears in revenue collection to the extent of about Rs.50,000 crores or more, out of which Rs.40,000 crores belongs to the direct taxes sector! Why could the Government not collect this amount? Of course, the Finance Minister has recently raised an argument. He has said that this amount has accumulated during the last several years and it is not the responsibility of his Government. This money has accumulated during the period of various Governments. Sir, you have come to power on the basis of a slogan that you are going to give a better Government, an efficient Government. You want to chalk out a new path. Therefore, you cannot say like that. That argument does not hold water. Why can't you take steps to realise this amount? I doubt whether this Government has the guts to do it. Take, for example, the Mauritius-based company. Recently, an incident has taken place. Certain notices were served by the Income-tax Department. What had happened

6.00 P.M

immediately? Of course, the Finance Minister, at the first instance, has stated that whatever is done by the Department, is a normal thing, according to the law, and there is no question of budging from that. But immediately, in the share market, the prices of shares were brought down. There was a heavy fall in the prices of shares, and therefore, what had happened at that time when the Government withdrew from the field? They were all kept free. Now, they can do whatever they like, whatever be the rule or law in force. Why can't this amount be used? Secondly, in the nationalised banks, as on 31st March, 1999, funds worth Rs. 50,000 crores were there as Non-Performing Assets. This is a new name that is being given to defaulters. They are all defaulters who were required to pay this money to the banks which had not been paid in time. Why don't you publish their names? Why could new laws not be passed by the Parliament to take necessary action to realise that money? This is a staggering amount of Rs. 50,000 crores. So many other things can be pointed out. I would request the Government to consider this issue seriously and every possible effort should be made to recover this amount. This money could be used for normal purposes, it could be used for developmental activities. So, instead of putting your hands in the pocket of the poor man, there are other sources which can be exploited for this purpose. That is all what I have to say. With these words, I conclude.

श्री सतीश प्रधान (महाराष्ट्र) : धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष जी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : कृपया चार मिनट में अपनी बात समाप्त करें।

श्री सतीश प्रधान : हां, चार मिनट से भी कम लगेगा।...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : चलिए, तीन मिनट में खत्म कर दीजिए।...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : गौतम जी आपके पास बैठे हैं इनका ध्यान रखिएगा।

श्री सतीश प्रधान : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सबसे पहले मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को धन्यवाद दूंगा कि उन्होंने बहुत बड़े संकट के समय में अर्थव्यवस्था की जिम्मेदारी संभाली और प्रधान मंत्री जी की नजर के सामने जो उनकी इच्छा थी उसी ढंग से उन्होंने देश को संकट से बाहर निकालने की पूरी कोशिश की है, इसके लिए वह धन्यवाद के पात्र हैं। उनको धन्यवाद देना चाहिए और शुभकामनाएं भी देनी चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं दो-चार सुझाव माननीय मंत्री जी को देना चाहता हूं। टैक्सेज का बर्डन हो रहा है इस कारण सभी जगहों से चिल्लाना उसी समय शुरू होता है जब बजट आता है तो इसी विषय पर चर्चा होती है। मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से विनती करना चाहूंगा कि सरकार का जो खर्चा होता है, व्यय होता है उसके ऊपर हम ध्यान देकर क्या वहां कुछ कटौती करने की कोशिश कर सकते हैं? जहां डुप्लीकेशन आफ वर्क है वहां खास तौर से हम गौर से देखने की कोशिश कर सकेंगे।

मैं बताना चाहूंगा कि आपने रेगुलेटरीज अथारिटीज बनाई हैं, वह भले ही टेलीफोन के लिए बनाई हैं, भले ही इंश्योरेंश के लिए बनाई हैं और कई जगहों पर बनाई हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हम लोगों ने सेक्रेट्रिएट और पूरा का पूरा स्टाफ उनके हाथ में दिया हुआ है और उनको यही सब काम करने की जिम्मेदारी दी गई है। उसी में से थोड़ा काम काटकर के उनको काम दिया गया है और बताया गया है कि इस अथारिटी का निर्माण किया गया है। यह उनका काम है। अथारिटी बनने के बाद वह ठीक ढंग से काम कर रही है या नहीं कर रही है यह देखने का काम सेक्योरिटी का है। मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है कि यह डुप्लीकेशन आफ वर्क क्यों है? बैंकों का काम कर्जा देना है, पैसे का व्यवहार करना है, रिकवरी करना है। यह सब उनके काम हैं, फिर भी वह काम उनके पास होते हुए भी हमारे पास रिकवरी ट्रिब्युनल है, सेटलमेंट कमेटी है। जो काम बैंक के अफसर लोगों ने करना है क्या वही काम करने के लिए हमें दूसरी व्यवस्था करने की कोई खास आवश्यकता है? मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि हम यहां कुछ कटौती कर सकते हैं या नहीं? इस विषय पर आप कुछ सोचिए।

सर, बैंकों के ऊपर बोर्ड ऑफ डाइरेक्टर्स की नियुक्ति की जाती है। उनका संचालन करने के लिए ऐसी व्यवस्था आवश्यक है तो यह करना चाहिए, लेकिन उसके लिए भी कुछ क्राइटएरिया होने की आवश्यकता है। बैंकों के ऊपर जो डायरेक्टर्स की नियुक्ति की जाती है, उनके लिए भी कुछ क्वालीफिकेशन होने की आवश्यकता है। अगर उनकी भी नियुक्ति अभी तक राजनीतिक ढंग से होती है और वही हम आगे चलाने वाले हैं तो हमारे में और हमसे पहले राज कारोबार चलाने वालों में क्या फर्क रहा? आपको इस विषय पर गौर से सोचना चाहिए। राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ताओं के लिए कुछ जगह करनी हैं तो उनके लिए यहां के अलावा और बहुत सारी जगह हैं। लेकिन बैंक में ही राजनीतिक नियुक्ति क्यों की जाती है? इससे बैंकों का व्यवहार बिगड़ जाता है और हम मुसीबत में फंस जाते हैं।

सर, बैंकों की तरफ से जो कर्जा दिया जाता है उसमें हमने एक अच्छी व्यवस्था देखी है। किसी कम्पनी का पर्सनल आदमी या इंडिव्युजल कर्जा मांगने के लिए बैंक के पास जाएगा तो उसके विषय की पूरी जानकारी हम एकत्रित करके, कम्प्युटराइजेशन करके रख

लेंगे। मेरा सुझाव इससे थोड़ा आगे बढ़कर है। हम पारदर्शिता की बात करते हैं, तो क्यों न इसके बारे में पूरा का पूरा वेब साइड का निर्माण करके उसमें सारी सूचना इकट्ठी कर दें जिससे उसके बारे में सारी दुनिया को मालूम हो जाये। कुछ लोग पैसा लेकर डुबा देते हैं, कई जगह पर लोग पैसा वापस देते नहीं हैं । जहां पर मुनाफा होता है वहां पर सब बिजनिस करते हैं, लेकिन जहां मुनाफा नहीं होता है वहां पर सब कम्पनीज घाटे में चली जाती हैं और उनको कोई परवाह नहीं होती है। सरकार के बैंकों से कर्जा लेकर यह सब व्यवहार चल रहा है। अगर हम इस विषय पर कुछ करके पूरी की पूरी ट्रांसपरेंसी लाने के लिए कि किसने यह व्यवहार किया, क्या कर रहा है यह सब लोगों के सामने आने देंगे तो यह बहुत अच्छा होगा। हम बैंक से या फाइनेंशियल इंस्टीट्यूट से पैसा लेने के लिए एप्लीकेशन देते हैं कि हमें पैसा चाहिए, हमें कर्जा चाहिए बिजनिस करना है या कुछ और करना है। मैं सुरेश प्रभु जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहूंगा कि उन्होंने अपने डिपार्टमेंट में यह व्यवस्था की है कि अगर किसी की एप्लीकेशन आएगी तो उस एप्लीकेशन का पूरा प्रोसेस वेब साइड पर डाल दिया जायेगा। उसका परिणाम यह होगा कि पूरी ट्रांसपरेंसी हो जायेगी। इसी प्रकार से बैंकों में यह व्यवस्था करने में किसी को कोई आपत्ति नहीं हो सकती है। किसी का यह कहना कि मेरा बिजनिस सीक्रेट है, मैं इसके बारे में नहीं बताऊंगा तो इससे ऊपर उठकर बात करनी चाहिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, एक और विषय है। हमारे यहां बहुत सारे प्रमाण हैं । हिन्दुस्तान में जगह-जगह पर एअरपोर्ट्स हैं। ये अच्छी-अच्छी जगह पर बने हुए हैं। यहां के किसानों के मुनाफे के लिए जो चीजें बनती हैं इनको विदेश में एक्सपोर्ट करने के लिए आसानी हो इसके लिए कुछ प्रावधान करने चाहिए।

आज की तारीख में होता यह है कि किसान ने किसी चीज का उत्पादन किया और उन्हें वह चीज एक्सपोर्ट करनी है, मान लीजिए - वह उत्तर प्रदेश में रहता है या कहीं और रहता है। तो उसे पहले दिल्ली में आना पड़ता है, मुम्बई में आना पड़ता है या कलकत्ता में आना पड़ता है, चेन्नई में जाना पड़ता है और कहीं से वह अपनी चीज का एक्सपोर्ट नहीं कर सकता है।

उसमें ऐसा कुछ प्रावधान कर सकते हैं कि किसान का जहां उत्पादन है, वहीं पर नज़दीक के एयरपोर्ट से वह ऐक्सपोर्ट कर सके । ऐसी सुविधा आप किसानों को दें नहीं तो इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि बड़े एयरपोर्ट्स पर भी ज्यादा बर्डन हो जाता है । एयर इंडिया वाले बोलते हैं कि हमारे पास जगह नहीं है, अभी हम आपका माल नहीं ले जाएंगे । मेरे पास एक कटिंग है - डेली बीस टन हापूस आंबा विदेशों में ऐक्सपोर्ट होता था लेकिन एयर इंडिया वालों ने वह लेकर जाने के लिए मना कर दिया । उन्होंने कहा कि जगह नहीं

है, जिससे वह ऐक्सपोर्ट नहीं हो पाया । यदि किसानों को इस प्रकार से मारा जाएगा तो हमारा उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ेगा ? कैसे हमारी आय बढ़ेगी, इस विषय पर सोचने की आवश्यकता है । अतः मैं अनुरोध करता हूं कि इस विषय पर आप ध्यान दीजिए । इसके साथ-साथ मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं - मेरे पास दूसरी एक न्यूज़ है - एक किसान की कहीं पर ज़मीन थी । कोई सरकारी प्रोजैक्ट वहां पर आ गया जिसकी वजह से उसे वहां से हटाकर किसी दूसरी जगह पर ज़मीन दी गयी ।यह सांगली डिस्ट्रिक्ट की कहानी है । उसने वह जगह खरीद ली लेकिन फिर बाद में सरकार ने कहा कि यह जगह सूटेबल नहीं है, दूसरी जगह पर जाओ । वह जगह खरीदने के लिए उसने 9 हज़ार रुपए कर्ज़ लिया था । उसको वहां से हटाकर दूसरी जगह ज़मीन दी गयी किन्तु उस जगह पर उत्पादन नहीं हुआ । परिणाम यह हुआ कि जो 9 हज़ार रुपये उसने कर्ज़ लिया था, वह बढ़कर तीस हज़ार तक पहुंच गया। बाद में जब उसने संबंधित अफसरों से कहा कि मेरे साथ अन्याय हो रहा है तो अफसरों ने सुनने से भी मना कर दिया । आखिर में उसको विकास कार्यालय के अंदर फांसी लगाकर मरने के लिए मजबूर होना पड़ा । यह बहुत ही दुखद घटना है । ऐसी घटना हमारे यहां, हमारे राज्य में जहां अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी बहुत अच्छे ढंग से सरकार चलाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, हुई है । इस संबंध में सतर्क होने की जरूरत है । आखिरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे यहां टैक्सिज़ बहुत प्रकार के हैं। विविध प्रकार के टैक्सिज़ हैं। क्या इस संबंध में सोचकर एक पैकेज लाया जा सकता है? जैसे कई प्रकार के टैक्सिज़ हैं, हर समय उनके लिए अलग-अलग फॉर्म्स भरने पड़ते हैं । हालांकि आपने उसमें सरलता लाने की बहुत कोशिश की है लेकिन क्या इस संबंध में एक पैकेज लाया जा सकता है ताकि वह आसानी से टैक्स भर सके ? अगर आप इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था कर देंगे तो लोगों में टैक्स देने की इच्छा शक्ति बढ़ेगी । आपने जो कोशिशें की हैं, उससे टैक्स देने वालों की संख्या बढ़ी है, उसके लिए आपका धन्यवाद ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : कृपया आप समाप्त करें ।

श्री सतीश प्रधान : एक आखिरी बात कहना चाहता हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : और कितने आखिरी होंगे ? कई आखिरी हो गये हैं ।

श्री सतीश प्रधान : बस एक आखिरी बात यह कहनी है कि सेबी का जो कारोबार चल रहा है, वह भी इसे वैबसाइट पर लाए हैं लेकिन वहां अगर एक बड़ा व्यापारी खड़ा हो जाता है और उसके खड़ा होने पर, उसके चले जाने पर सारे का सारा बाज़ार गिरना शुरू हो जाता है । इस विषय पर सतर्क होने की आवश्यकता है । इसलिए इन सभी विषयों को

इंटरनैट पर लाकर, वैबसाइट पर लाकर इसमें सुलभता लाने की कोशिश करने की आवश्यकता है । इस संबंध में आपको विचार करना चाहिए । धन्यवाद ।

श्री गांधी आज़ाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद महोदय, इस विनियोग विधेयक, 2000 में वर्ष 2000-200। के लिए भारत की संचित निधि में से 78 खरब,49 अरब, 32 करोड़, 86 लाख रुपये दिये जाने का प्रावधान किया गया है जिसमें से ऋण ब्याज अदायगी के लिए 10 खरब, 56 अरब, 42 करोड़, 28 लाख और ऋण अदायगी के लिए 35 खरब, 47 अरब, 67 करोड़, 13 लाख दिये गये हैं । इस प्रकार केवल ब्याज और ऋण अदायगी के लिए 46 खरब, 04 अरब, 09 करोड़, 41 लाख रुपये की व्यवस्था की गयी है जो कुल संचित निधि का लगभग 60 प्रतिशत से अधिक है । इस प्रकार यदि हम अपनी संचित निधि का 60 प्रतिशत से अधिक धन केवल ऋण और ब्याज अदायगी में खर्च करते हैं तो यह हमारे देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था की बदहाली और कंगाली का एक नमूना है ।

जब हम केवल साठ प्रतिशत इसमें खर्च करते हैं तो चालीस प्रतिशत से यहां की कृषि का विकास, शिक्षा का विकास, औद्योगिक विकास, नगरों का विकास, ग्रामों का विकास तथा देश से गरीबी का उन्मूलन किस तरह से किया जा सकता है? मैं मंत्रीजी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर सचमुच देश में खुशहाली लानी है तो कुछ सख्ती से काम लेकर राजकोषीय घाटे को कम करना चाहिए, राज्य के खर्चे में कटौती करनी चाहिए, राजस्व की वसूली में बढ़ोत्तरी करनी चाहिए और देश की आमदनी के लिए किसी अन्य स्रोत का पता लगाकर बढ़ोत्तरी करनी चाहिए ताकि ब्याज अदायगी एवं ऋण अदायगी से हम जल्द से जल्द उऋण हो सकें तभी वास्तव में कृषि का विकास, शिक्षा का विकास, ग्रामों का विकास, शहरों का विकास, औद्योगिक विकास करके देश से गरीबी का उन्मूलन किया जा सकता है और देश का विकास किया जा सकता है । धन्यवाद ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : श्री बलबीर पुंज ....देखिए, वैसे आपके दल ने पूरा समय ले लिया है लेकिन आपने नाम दिया है इसलिए मैं आपको मौका दे रहा हूं । कृपया समय का ध्यान रखें ।

श्री बलबीर के. पुंज (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपका बहुत आभारी हूं लेकिन मैं यह नहीं कहूंगा कि मैं बहुत संक्षेप में बोलूंगा । मैं आपको ऐसा कोई आश्वासन नहीं देना चाहता क्योंकि मैंने सदन में देखा कि जिन-जिन लोगों ने यह कहा कि वे बहुत संक्षेप में बोलेंगे, उन्होंने अपना वादा नहीं निभाया । मैं अपने पहले भाषण में वादा खिलाफी नहीं करना चाहता । इसलिए इस तरह का मेरा आपसे कोई प्रॉमिस नहीं है कि मैं बहुत संक्षेप में बोलूंगा ।

महोदय, आज हम बजट पर चर्चा कर रहे हैं और मैं मानता हूं कि वित्त मंत्री के पास कोई बहुत सरल विकल्प उपलब्ध नहीं थे । यह बजट केवल पिछले दो साल के बजट के रूप में नहीं देखा जाना चाहिए । इसके पीछे पचास साल का इतिहास है और हम उस इतिहास से अपने आप को काट नहीं सकते । सन् 1947 में जब करीब डेढ़ सौ साल की गुलामी के बाद हमने आज़ादी की सांस ली तो भारत का हिस्सा अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार में दो प्रतिशत था । पचास साल के बाद इंटरनेशनल ट्रेड में भारत का भाग लगभग आधा प्रतिशत से भी कम रह गया है । यह किस तरह की नीतियां थीं जो चलीं ? देश आज़ाद हुआ और समाजवाद का नारा लगा, गरीबी हटाओ का नारा लगा और उसमें जो व्यक्ति अर्थव्यवस्था में प्रतिस्पर्धा की बात करते थे, जो चाहते थे कि भारत की प्रतिभा को प्रोत्साहन मिले, उन व्यक्तियों को सी.आई.ए. का एजेंट, अमरीका का पिट्ठू, इस तरह की उपाधियों से विभूषित किया गया । एक खुली इंटेलेक्चुअल डिबेट 1990 तक इस देश में आर्थिक विषयों पर संभव नहीं हो सकी और इसमें हमारे जो वामपंथी मित्र हैं, उनका बड़ा कंट्रीब्यूशन है कि through sheer intellectual terrorism, they make sure that no honest debate on any economic subject should take place. पर 1990 का साल दुनिया में भी और भारत के लिए भी एक माइलस्टोन सिद्ध हुआ, मील का पत्थर साबित हुआ । 1990 में सोवियत संघ का विघटन हुआ और जो एक मायाजाल था, जिसे कहना चाहिए कि बहुत इकॉनामिक प्रॉस्पेरिटी वहां पर है, आर्थिक रूप से सबल देश है, वहां के लोग बड़े सम्पन्न हैं, उसका पर्दाफाश हो गया। उससे अपने देश में भी दोबारा से स्थिति को देखने का अवसर मिला और 1990-91 में जब नई सरकार आई, डॉ. मनमोहन सिंह जिसमें वित्त मंत्री थे, उस समय देश की स्थिति क्या थी ?

1991-92 में अर्थव्यवस्था की दर एक प्रतिशत से भी कम थी और इंडस्ट्रियल ग्रोथ रेट की दर आधा प्रतिशत से भी से कम थी। फूडग्रेन प्रोडक्शन 166 मिलियन टन तक नीचे आ गया था। सबसे गंभीर बात यह हुई कि हम अंतर्राष्ट्रीय देनदारियों को पूरा नहीं कर पा रहे थे। इसके लिए सरकार को अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में रातों रात सोने को गिरवी रखना पड़ा। विदेशी बैंक हमें कर्जा नहीं दे रहे थे, एनआईआर डिपोजिट बैंकों से गायब हो रहे थे। विदेशी मुद्रा का भंडार दो सप्ताह के आयात के लिए भी काफी नहीं था। अचानक इस स्थिति में हमारे कांग्रेसी मित्रों को ज्ञान हुआ और उन्होंने आर्थिक सुधारों की बात कहनी शुरू की। इस प्रश्न का उत्तर किसी ने नहीं दिया कि चालीस साल तक विकार कौन लाया। अगर आप आर्थिक सुधारों की बात करते हैं तो उन विकारों के लिए जिम्मेदार कौन था जिन्होंने 1990 में इस राष्ट्र को एक विनाश के कगार पर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया? इस प्रश्न का उत्तर बहुत जरूरी है। हम लोग जानते हैं कि 1990 और 1995 के बीच में ग्लोबलाइजेशन की पॉलिसी

एकदम लाई गई। Somehow, it was believed that the failure of communism is the success of capitalism. ऐसा नहीं है अगर कम्युनिज्म फैला हुआ है तो इससे यह अर्थ नहीं निकाला जाना चाहिए कि पूंजीवादी अर्थव्यवस्था भी हम सारे विश्व पर लागू कर सकते हैं। इस विश्वास के साथ डॉ० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने अपनी नीतियां चलाई और पांच साल के बाद योजना आयोग ने टिप्पणी की, मैं यहां पर उद्धृत करने की अनुमति चाहता हूं। "1991-94 की अवधि में औसत मुद्रास्फीति की दर सुधारों से पहले वाली अवधि से अधिक रही है। सामान्य रूप से मूल्यों में हुई वृद्धि के मुकाबले खाद्य पदार्थों में अधिक तेजी से वृद्धि हुई है। 1992-95 में रोजगार में प्रतिवर्ष दो प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई जो आठवीं योजना के 2.6 से 2.8 प्रतिशत तक के लक्ष्य से कम है। क्षेत्रीय असामनताएं तो इससे भी ज्यादा हैं। बिहार, उत्तर प्रदेश और मध्य प्रदेश -- इन तीन राज्यों में राष्ट्रीय औसत वृद्धि के मुकाबले विकास की दर कहीं कम रही है। इस समीक्षा में आगे कहा गया है कि संगठित क्षेत्र को ऋण देने और योजना में निवेश की सीमा की स्थिति भी खराब हुई है। पूंजी निर्माण की दर, विशेष रूप से निजी क्षेत्र में यह दर सकल घरेलू उत्पाद के दो प्रतिशत की दर से तेजी से गिरी है। देश में सीधे निवेश का प्रवाह भी पूरी तरह आशा के अनुरूप नहीं रहा है। सरकारी निवेशों में सकल घरेलू उत्पाद की 1.7 प्रतिशत गिरावट आने से आधारभूत संरचना के क्षेत्रों में इसके गंभीर परिणाम हुए हैं। घरेलू बचतों में तेजी से कमी होने के कारण ही प्रमुख रूप से घरेलू बचत दर कम हुई है। समीक्षा में कहा गया था कि जब से नरसिंह राव सरकार ने सत्ता संभाली है तब से अर्थव्यवस्था के प्रमुख क्षेत्रों में वह असफल रही है। सरकार द्वारा बिना सोचे-समझे उधार लेने के कारण देश तेजी से ऋण में फंसता जा रहा है। जब नरसिंह राव की सरकार आई तब ऋण 1.63 लाख करोड़ रुपए था और जब यह सरकार गई तब यह ऋण तीन लाख करोड़ रुपए हो गया था। यह आर्थिक विपत्ति देश पर क्यों आई? क्योंकि अर्थ संकल्प, बजट इंडिया सेंट्रिक नहीं थे, ग्लोबल सेंट्रिक थे। वे इस बात की चर्चा करते थे कि फारेन इन्वेस्टमेंट कितना आएगा, फारेन इन्वेस्टमेंट का क्या होगा? और गलत नीति बनाई गई और विदेशी निवेश करने वालों को ध्यान में रखकर बनाई गई। ...**(व्यवधान)**... इंडिया सेंट्रिक नीतियों के लिए मैं यशवंत सिन्हा जी को बधाई देता हूं। पिछले दो बजट आए उनमें फारेन इन्वेस्टमेंट की बात बहुत बढ़ाचढ़ा कर लिखी गई। वे नीतियां इंडिया सेंट्रिक थीं और उनके परिणाम हम सब लोगों के सामने हैं मार्च 1998 में जीडीपी की वार्षिक गति पांच प्रतिशत थी, आज वह बढ़कर 5.9 प्रतिशत हो गई है।

इस वित्त वर्ष में इससे बढ़कर 6.5 प्रतिशत होने का अनुमान है । कुछ दशक पहले भारत के विकास की गति 2.3 प्रतिशत रखी गई, जिसे हिंदू रेट ऑफ ग्रोथ कहा जाता था । मैं नहीं जानता कि डेरोगेटड रेफरेंस क्यों था पर आज यह इतिहास का विषय है और

अब हम 7-8 प्रतिशत गति की ओर देख रहे हैं । इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन का रेट भी आठ प्रतिशत तक जा चुका है । मुद्रास्फीति, जो 1990-91 में 17 प्रतिशत तक चली गई थी, मनमोहन सिंह जी के काल में तो 11,12,13 प्रतिशत तक रही आज वह 4,5,6 के हिसाब से चल रही है । यह माना जा सकता है कि इन अर्थ संकल्पों की वजह से देश की अर्थव्यवस्था में विशेष रूप से गति आई है । परंतु इसके साथ-साथ मैं वित्त मंत्री जी से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक नये क्षेत्र हैं, इंफोर्मेशन टेक्नोलॉजी एण्ड कम्प्यूटर आदि, इन पर ध्यान देने की जरूरत है । साथ ही साथ भारत के परंपरागत क्षेत्र, ऐसे पांच-छह क्षेत्र हैं तथा इनकी स्टडी सरकार द्वारा भी की गई है, इन पर भी ज्यादा ध्यान देने की जरूरत है । कपड़ा उद्योग में 1.30 लाख करोड़ रुपये का पूंजी निवेश हुआ है यह लगभग 45 हजार करोड़ रुपये का निर्यात करता है । हमारे देश में व्यापार के माध्यम से जो कुल विदेशी पूंजी आती है उसका 35 प्रतिशत इसी से आता है तथा इसमें 3 करोड़ लोग एम्प्लोइड हैं । इसी प्रकार रसायन के क्षेत्र में एक लाख करोड़ रुपये की पूंजी लगी हुई है, चाय के क्षेत्र में सात लाख करोड़ की पूंजी लगी हुई है तथा इसमें बारह लाख लोगों को रोजगार मिला हुआ है । खाने के तेल और चीनी उद्योग भी ऐसे ही क्षेत्र हैं । इन परंपरागत उद्योगों के बारे में पुनः विचार करना चाहिए तथा नीतियां बनानी चाहिए । हमारे वामपंथी मित्रों ने भी बताया कि अर्थव्यवस्था को कैसे चलाना चाहिए ।...***(समय की घंटी)***

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : आप कृपया आसन ग्रहण करें । देखिए, वैसे मैं आपको टोकना नहीं चाहता था आपकी मैडेन स्पीच है लेकिन संबंधित दलों को ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि जो ऐसे स्पीकर हैं, जिनकी मैडेन स्पीच हो उनके नाम पहले रखें । आपका नाम सबसे बाद में दिया, आपने सारा समय ले लिया फिर भी आपकी स्पीच अधूरी रह गई, यह मुझे अच्छा नहीं लग रहा । आपके दल ने अन्याय किया ।

श्री बलबीर के. पुंज : मेरे दल ने अन्याय किया, आप मत कीजिए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : जो मैडेन स्पीच देने वाले हैं उनका नाम पहले देना चाहिए ।

श्री बलबीर के. पुंज : मैं पांच मिनट में समाप्त करता हूं ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : पांच मिनट तो बहुत हैं ।

श्री बलबीर के.पुंज : मैं तीन मिनट में समाप्त करूंगा । वामपंथी मित्रों ने बताया कि देश को किस तरह से चलाना चाहिए । माननीय सदस्या श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी जी ने दोपहर में स्पेशल मेंशन के दौरान बताया कि पश्चिमी बंगाल में किस तरह से इंदिरा

आवास योजना का इम्प्लिमेंटेशन किया गया है । अगर आप पिछले बीस वर्षों के आंकड़े देखें तो पता चलेगा कि पश्चिम बंगाल का कितना बुरा हाल हुआ है । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि इन नीतियों का पालन किया गया तो वह पूरे देश के साथ हो सकता है जो पश्चिमी बंगाल के साथ हुआ । बीस साल पहले राज्यों की आर्थिक प्रगति की जो लिस्ट थी उसमें पश्चिमी बंगाल का नौवां नम्बर था । आर्थिक प्रगति में वह नौवें स्थान पर था । आज यह सोलहवें नम्बर पर चला गया है । इसी प्रकार से पश्चिमी बंगाल में पर-कैपिटा इनकम दस सालों में 2.69 प्रतिशत की दर से बढ़ी है । चौदह बड़े राज्यों का जो राष्ट्रीय औसत है वह 3.16 प्रतिशत है । इंट्रस्ट पेमेंट की दृष्टि से भी पश्चिम बंगाल कर्जे के सागर में डूबता जा रहा है । 9.97 प्रतिशत राजस्व का हिस्सा पहले इंट्रस्ट चुकाने में जाता था आज वह 17.56 प्रतिशत से 23.58 प्रतिशत तक पहुंच गया है ।

इंदिरा आवास योजना की बात हो रही थी । इंदिरा आवास योजना में बंगाल में जो उसके पास इसके लिए राशि उपलब्ध थी उसका केवल 70 प्रतिशत उपयोग किया गया जब कि ऐवरेज 90 प्रतिशत है । महोदय, इसी तरह 1992 से लेकर 1996 तक जो टारगेट था, जो लक्ष्य था वह 1 लाख 93 हजार था लेकिन इसका जो लक्ष्य प्राप्त किया गया वह 57 प्रतिशत था जबकि राष्ट्रीय औसत जो है वह 90 प्रतिशत है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): अब आप कृपया समाप्त करिए ।

श्री बलबीर के. पुंज : क्योंकि आपने कहा है, इसलिए इतना कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिआ, इससे पहले कि आप अपनी बात शुरू करें मैं एक निवेदन करूं कि आपके दल के लिए जितना समय आवंटित था वह पूरा हो चुका है । दूसरी बात यह है कि आपका नाम पहले पुकारा गया था लेकिन आप उपस्थित नहीं थे और तीसरी बात यह है कि आपकी पार्टी के एक और सदस्य बोलने वाले हैं। इसलिए आपसे अनुरोध है कि आप केवल चार मिनट में अपनी बात रखें ।

श्री रामचन्द्र खूंटिआ (उड़ीसा) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात सही है कि समय बहुत कम है और समय के संदर्भ में मैं कोई ज्यादा इम्पार्टेंट एनालिसेस नहीं करना चाहता हूं । मगर एक बात मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा कि the hon. Finance Minister is present here. The Government is talking much about disinvestment of the public sector which is the way for providing money for the poor, the downtrodden and the persons who are living below the poverty line. My question is; around Rs. 2,40,000 crores were spent in the public sector. Now, the

Government is saying that they could not get the expected result. But the question remains whether we support or oppose disinvestment. That is one point. The point is, when we are appointing the Disinvestment Commission, when we are privitising the public sector, should you not fix accountability on the person, or the Government organisation, or whoever may be responsible, for this Rs. 2,30,000 crores which has been spent on which the public sector is incurring losses? Should we not fix the responsibility and enquire into the matter as to who was responsible for the loss of public sector investment and take necessary action against them. That is the main thing. The second point that I want to mention is, Sir, whether it is IRDP, whether it is PMRY, whether it is any other poverty alleviation programme we all know what is being done in the rural areas. It is a fact that 50 per cent of the money is not going to the beneficiaries. It has become a habit with the banks. The banks are not giving loans. What are they doing? They are only giving subsidy, that too, 20 per cent of the subsidy is being distributed among the bank officers, block officers, taluk officers and some of the middlemen. That is being done. So, my question is, how do we try to check this corruption, this leakage of revenue? We must also analyse, monitor, how these things are being done in the rural areas.

Sir, I want to say one thing here about utilisation of the Government money, specially by the Labour Department in the MCPL project. In 1997-98, the Budget Estimate was Rs. 7843 lakhs and the Revised Estimate was Rs. 3573 lakhs, but the actual expenditure was Rs. 1317 lakhs, in 1998-99 the Budget Estimate was Rs. 5000 lakhs and the Revised Estimate was Rs. 2000 lakhs, but the expenditure was Rs. 2732 lakhs. My point is, the whole world is talking about abolition of child labour. The Government has a policy of abolition of child labour in hazardous industries. So, gradually, the Budget allocation is being reduced for child labour projects in the Government of India. The second thing is, whatever money is being allocated is actually not being spent. Here, the Revised Estimate is Rs. 3573 lakhs but and the expenditure is Rs. 1317 lakhs. This is the utilisation of the Government money. But what is being allocated in the Budget?

Another point that I want to mention here is about the money which is allocated for the development of tribal areas. The total money allocated is around Rs.563.43 lakhs and the total expenditure has been Rs.322.49 lakhs, which is on vocational training centres for tribal people and so on. Whatever money has been allocated has not been spent. Till January 2000,

around 50% or 60% of the money has been spent and another 40% or 50% has been spent in these two or three months. It is a very dangerous trend. I can say it with guts that 40% or 50% of the money has been misappropriated or misused. It has been falsely shown as expenditure, only paper work is done.

Another point that I want to mention here is about my own State of Orissa. As you know, Sir, Orissa is cyclone-affected, drought-affected and it has also been affected by all the natural calamities.. The financial condition of Orissa is very bad. As you know, Sir, the National Development Council had devised a parameter to give some sort of financial assistance to weak States so as to enable them to carry on their development work and also physical reforms in the State. But that has not yielded good results. As you are aware, Sir, Orissa is a very poor State. At the present moment, the Government of Orissa has no money to pay the salaries of its staff. It is also alleged that the money that has been given for rehabilitation work in connection with the cyclone, has been used for paying the salaries of the Government staff.

The abundance of natural resources of the State is illustrated by the following facts. It commands 90 per cent of the country's chromite reserves, 86 per cent of nickel ore, 70 per cent of bauxite, 28 per cent of manganese, 33 per cent of graphite, 31 per cent of rare earths, 26 per cent of iron ore, and 24 per cent of coal. Besides, the State boasts of 56,000 sq. km. of forests, 450 km of coastline and 10 per cent of the country's inland water resources. And such a lavishly-endowed Orissa has only five per cent of the land area and four per cent of the human resource of the country. With all these things in mind, the Government of Orissa and the people of Orissa are demanding that the State of Orissa should be treated as a Special Category State because Orissa does not have enough money to pay for the 50% share of the Centrally-Sponsored Schemes and programmes and also in view of the cyclone, drought, floods and all the natural calamities. Orissa has gone behind by thirty years. It is just not possible that the Orrissa Government can pay for the 50% share of all Centrally- sponsored programmes. That is why...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : कृपया आसन ग्रहण करें । आप दूसरे माननीय सदस्य को बोलने दें ।

SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: I request the Government of India and the Finance Minister to take all the necessary steps to declare the State of Orissa as a Special Category State and accordingly the financial assistance may be given to the State of Orissa.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think it is your maiden speech.

SHRI NABAM REBIA (Arunachal Pradesh): It is not my maiden speech, exactly. In just more than three years, I have spoken only twice on the floor of this House. मैं बहुत कम बोलता हूं, लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि मैं बोल नहीं सकता हूं । मैं बोल सकता हूं । लेकिन जो एक्सपीरियेंस्ड सदस्य हैं, उनको ज्यादा चांस मिले, मैं उनको सुनता हूं। As you are saying that time is very short, I will try to be very, very precise and, therefore, I will confine myself to the North-Eastern Region in general and Arunachal Pradesh in particular. First of all, I would like to commend the hon. Finance Minister for presenting the first Budget of the new millennium. I am also thankful to him for taking the trouble of mentioning the North-Eastern Region in his speech.

He has understood, he has accepted, the fact that infrastructure development of the region is the only solution, the only remedy, to remove the sense of isolation from the people of that region, and to bring them into the national stream. For that, I am extremely thankful to him.

When we talk of other States, I would always like to remind of the Central leaders, the Central Government, that India attained Independence in 1947. So far as Arunachal Pradesh is concerned, it was called the North-East Frontier Agency, NEFA. Let me be very frank. Truth may hurt. But only after 1962, the year I was born, everything started coming to Arunachal Pradesh. There was nothing in Arunachal Pradesh in 1962. People say that there were only three primary schools in 1947; that too, these schools were mostly located in Assam. Now, imagine the position when we compare Arunachal Pradesh with the rest of the country! This aspect should always be taken into consideration - a State, having only 3 primary schools in 1947, when India attained Independence. This factor, I think, the Government at the Centre should always take care when drawing any comparison between Arunachal Pradesh and the rest of the States, the other parts of the country. These factors should always be taken into consideration. Till today, we do not have any airport; we do not have a good road there; no proper communication. We have always been asking that all

those roads be taken over by the BRO. The Government should take this into account. The State Government has been making this request to the Government, all the time, repeatedly. The North-Eastern Council which was set up by Mrs. Gandhi has also not lived up to the expectation of the people of the region, primarily because of financial constraint. I think, the Bill has already been introduced in Parliament. The functioning of the North-Eastern Council, should be throughly reviewed.

I now come to the special package. The Special package has become synonymous with the North-Eastern region. Every Government that comes to power announces a special package for the North-East. But when you announce a special package, you attach so many conditions to it, so many strings to it, that it becomes practically impossible to implement it. Ultimately, these packages become a part of the normal Plan outlay of the States. Therefore, we, the people of the North-Eastern region, sometimes, we can't understand, we can't appreciate, the real intention of the Centre behind announcing such packages. So, be it any package, please announce it with an open heart if you want to do it. When you attach so many conditions, so many strings, to it, you can't implement it. The persons for whom you have announced these packages, are ultimately not going to get the benefits.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister has understood and has acknowledged the agricultural and horticultural potential of the North Eastern region. I warmly welcome it. He has also announced the setting up of a Technology Mission for Horticulture Development. The announcement is very much welcome.

Sir, Arunachal Pradesh has great potential for horticulture development. Therefore, I request you that it should not be treated like other packages. If you mean it for the people of this area, please let it go that way and ensure that it is not packaged again. This is my sincere appeal. Last time in the month of January the hon. Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee, made an announcement at the meeting of the Governors and Chief Ministers of the North-Eastern Region at Shillong. Unfortunately, that scheme has not found any mention in the Budget Speech of the hon. Finance Minister. I don't know the reason behind this. Sir, I welcome the establishment of the proposed National Institute of Biodiversity Studies in Arunachal Pradesh. Arunachal Pradesh is perhaps the only State in the country which has a forest cover of 82 per cent. The programme that you have announced should be

implemented expeditiously so that the people of this region can take some economic benefit from it. Sir, I repeat 82 per cent area in Arunachal Pradesh is under forest cover. Therefore, a lot of benefits can be taken and it can be exploited for the use of people there and the country as a whole. Sir, the recent hike in the prices of petroleum products especially the kerosene has adversely affected the people of the North-East particularly my State and other hilly areas. Sir, due to this hike in kerosene prices people will now largely depend on forests for their firewood which will lead to depletion of forests there. Therefore, I would sincerely request and appeal to the Finance Minister that he should continue with subsidy on kerosene for the hilly people particularly the North-Eastern Region. Sir, the Finance Minister has not mentioned anything about tourism in his Speech. There are eight States, including Sikkim, in the North-East. If there is a bomb blast in Assam, people say that there is a bomb blast in the North-East. If there is kidnapping in Nagaland, people say that there is a kidnapping in the North-East. But, it is not like that. Arunachal Pradesh is altogether different. In Arunachal Pradesh there is tremendous potential for tourism especially the eco-tourism and adventure tourism. We have a lot of potential in this regard. Therefore, you must give top priority to this sector. Sir, we have been requesting the Government for lifting the RAP, Restricted Area Permit. If you are not lifting it totally, at least, there should be some relaxation in this regard. The power to issue RAP should be delegated to the State Governments. Necessary guidelines can be given in this regard to the State Governments and they can accordingly allow the foreign tourists. Sir, this will increase the inflow of foreign tourists to the North-East and would promote tourism in that region. In many other States these restrictions have been relaxed; and in some cases have been lifted. Sir, in Arunachal Pradesh the conditions for the RAP should be relaxed and this authority should be delegated to the State Government.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कोशिक) : कृपया समाप्त करें ।

श्री नाबम रेबिया : आप कहते हैं, तो समाप्त कर देता हूं ।

Sir, just two minutes Sir, one more request.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कोशिक): आप महत्वपूर्ण बातें बोल रहे हैं, इस में कोई शक नहीं है, लेकिन यह तो आप के दल को भी चाहिए था कि जब आप को ऐसी महत्वपूर्ण बातें बोलनी थीं तो आप का नंबर पहले रखते, आप का नाम पहले देते ।

SHRI NABAM REBIA: I do appreciate. सर, मैं इंडिपेंडेंट मेंबर हूं । I am an associated Member. The funding of rural development programme has affected the North-Eastern Region. You have taken up the Employment Assurance Scheme on the basis of proportionate total rural poor population of the country. You are saying that we should check the population growth. We have the lowest density of population in the country and we are the worst affected by the new policy. If a State is having the lowest density of population, it should be rewarded. But, it is the other way round. We are the most affected by this policy. Sir, earlier, the allocation used to be made block-wise and now the allocation has already come down to only 10 per cent of the allocation we were getting earlier. This has adversely affected us. Therefore, I would request that this aspect should be considered. I am not going to say much. Sir, my sincere appeal to the Government is that. The Government, while formulating any policy or programme for the Region, simply should not allure or tempt the people of this Region but implement all the recommendations made by the Shukla Commission and many other initiatives taken by the Government in letter and spirit. With these words, I am extremely thankful to you for allowing me to speak on the Appropriation Bill. Thank you.

वित्त मंत्री (श्री यशवंत सिन्हा): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आभारी हूं उन सभी सदस्यों का जिन्होंने इस चर्चा में भाग लिया । उस से भी ज्यादा आभारी हूं उन सदस्यों का जो नाम बुलाने पर सदन से अनुपस्थित हो गए और सब से ज्यादा आभारी हूं उन सदस्यों का जिन्होंने सदन में रहते हुए भी चर्चा में भाग नहीं लिया ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, चर्चा का शुभारंभ करते हुए वरिष्ठ नेता श्री अर्जुन सिंह जी ने जिन ऊचाइयों पर विचरण किया, वहां तक जाने की धृष्टता मैं नहीं कर सकता । इसलिए उन सारे मुद्दों को मैं उस दिन के लिए छोड़ता हूं जब वैसे मुद्दों पर यहां चर्चा होगी । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बैठे हुए सोच रहा था कि आज की चर्चा का सारांश क्या होना चाहिए । तो सारांश यह था कि मुझे करों को कम कर देना चाहिए, जो बहुत सारे मद हैं उन के लिए पैसा और देना चाहिए और सब्सिडी में जो हम ने कटौती की है, उसे फिर से रिस्टोर कर देना चाहिए । उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वित्त मंत्रालय में थोड़ी-बहुत जादूगरी तो आदमी सीखता है, लेकिन मेरे पास इतनी जादूगरी नहीं है कि मैं यह सब कर दूं और उस के बाद भी भारत सरकार का बजट, बजट जैसा देखने में लगे ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय यह सही है, जैसा कि विप्लव बाबू ने कहा और मुझे खुशी है कि वह आ गए हैं, हालांकि उन्होंने कहा था कि शायद उत्तर के समय सदन में नहीं रहूंगा ।

उन्होंने कहा कि भारत सरकार का जो बजट है, उस में रिजिडिटी आ गयी है, उस में इस प्रकार की गांठें आ गयी हैं कि उस में किसी भी वित्त मंत्री के लिए सहूलियत नहीं है, फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी नहीं है । इसलिए बहुत हाथ-पांव मारने के बाद भी कहीं आप 500 करोड़ रुपया बढ़ा देते हैं, कहीं 200 करोड़ रुपया बढ़ा देते हैं क्योंकि भारत सरकार का जो अधिकांश खर्चा है, वह ऐसे मुद्दों के ऊपर है जिस में कि आप को कहीं कोई जिसे 'रूम ऑफ मनूवर' कहते हैं, वह कोई उपाय आप के पास नहीं है चाहे वह इंटरेस्ट बर्डन हो, चाहे वह डिफेंस हो, चाहे वह सब्सिडी हो, चाहे वह एस्टेब्लिशमेंट एक्सपेंडीचर हो ।

और फिसकल डेफिसिट की चर्चा हो रही थी, यह सही है कि फिसकल डेफिसिट एक चिंता का विषय है लेकिन, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बताना चाहूंगा कि चाहे भारत सरकार की बात हो, चाहे राज्य सरकारों की बात हो, एक चौंकाने वाला तथ्य यह है कि 1996-97 के वर्ष में भारत सरकार का स्थापना खर्च और पेंशन, इन दोनों को मिलाकर 37,401 करोड़ रुपए था, जो कि इस साल के बजट में बढ़कर, इस्टेब्लिशमेंट एंड पेंशन, 73,646 करोड़ रुपए हो गया है । यह राशि इसलिए नहीं बढ़ी कि हमने, सरकार ने कोई बहुत भारी संख्या बढ़ा दी बल्कि यह इसलिए बढ़ गई क्योंकि इसी बीच में पांचवां वेतन आयोग आ गया और उसका जो असर पड़ा है भारत सरकार के बजट पर और राज्य सरकारों के बजट पर, उससे स्थिति काफी बिगड़ी है और उसको हम सब मिलकर झेलने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं । फिर भी जैसा मैंने 1998-99 के बजट में कहा था कि हम ऐक्सपेंडिचर कमीशन बनाएंगे, मेरे पूर्ववर्ती वित्त मंत्री श्री चिदम्बरम जी ने भी इसका उल्लेख किया था लेकिन वे नहीं बना पाए, मुझे खुशी है कि मैंने ऐक्सपेंडिचर कमीशन बना दिया है और उसने काम करना शुरू कर दिया है। मुझे आशा है और जैसा कि यहां पर कई माननीय सदस्यों ने भी कहा है कि हम सिर्फ एक, दो, चार पद यहां-वहां न काटें, सरकार के वे सारे काम, सारे फंक्शन जिनकी अब आवश्यकता ही नहीं रही, क्योंकि उनके बदले हमने कोई दूसरी व्यवस्था बना दी है, वैसे सारे फंक्शन्स को ऐक्सपेंडिचर कमीशन देखे और वे हमें यह सिफारिश करे कि इस फंक्शन की आवश्यकता नहीं है, इसलिए यह विभाग या मंत्रालय या उसके एक महत्वपूर्ण टुकड़े को अब हमें बनाए रखने की आवश्यकता नहीं है । मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि इस प्रकार की सिफारिश हमें ऐक्सपेंडिचर कमीशन से जल्दी प्राप्त होने लगेगी और उसके बाद सरकार के स्थापना खर्च को कम करने का काम सुचारू रूप से चलेगा ।

जहां तक अर्थव्यवस्था में प्रगति का सवाल है, उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं माननीय सदस्यों को कहना चाहूंगा कि ये जो दो वर्ष बीते हैं, ये वर्ष अत्यंत चुनौती के वर्ष थे और सब लोग इस बात को जानते हैं कि हमारे सामने क्या चुनौतियां थीं और आने वाले दिनों में भी क्या चुनौतियां हैं । आज के दिन हमारे सामने सुखाड़ की एक भयंकर समस्या है और चूंकि

राज्यों की माली हालत अत्यंत ही दयनीय हो गई है इसलिए हर कोई यही उम्मीद करता है कि वे भारत सरकार के पास आएंगे और हम कहीं न कहीं से उसकी व्यवस्था करके राज्यों को जो मदद करनी है, वह करेंगे । हम तत्परता से मदद करने का प्रयास कर भी रहे हैं, की भी है और आने वाले दिनों में भी हम इसको करते रहेंगे, लेकिन इससे हमारा भार बढ़ता है ।

यहां पर रक्षा के बजट का भी उल्लेख हुआ और यह कहा गया कि हम कूटनीति के माध्यम से अगर काम करें तो शायद हम रक्षा के बजट को कम कर सकते हैं । कूटनीति के क्षेत्र में पिछले दो वर्षों में जो सफलता भारत को मिली है, मैं समझता हूं कि उसके बारे में बहुत कुछ मुझे कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है क्योंकि न केवल यह सदन, यह देश बल्कि सारी दुनिया आज इस बात को स्वीकार कर रही है कि कूटनीति के क्षेत्र में भारत ने बहुत ही भारी सफलताएं प्राप्त की हैं और इसमें हमें कहीं भी बगलें झांकने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन उसके साथ ही साथ मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि चूंकि 50 दिनों का भले ही एक सीमित युद्ध था, फिर भी युद्ध था और 50 दिनों का युद्ध हम अपने एक पड़ोसी के साथ लड़ चुके हैं, इसलिए उसके चलते जो हमें बढ़ोत्तरी करनी पड़ी रक्षा-प्रतिरक्षा के बजट में, वह हमने की है और उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बिल्कुल मज़बूती के साथ सदन में इस बात को रखना चाहता हूं कि प्रतिरक्षा के सवाल पर यह सरकार किसी प्रकार का कोई भी समझौता नहीं करेगी और रक्षा मंत्रालय के लिए जिस भी धन की आवश्यकता होगी, चाहे वह धन हमको कहीं से भी जुटाना पड़े, देश की सुरक्षा के लिए हम उस धन को जुटाने के लिए प्रतिबद्ध हैं और उसको हम करेंगे ।

जहां तक गरीबी का प्रश्न है, रोजगार का प्रश्न है, ये विकराल प्रश्न हैं और हमारे सामने दशकों से मुंह बाए खड़े हैं । मैं कल-परसों थाईलैंड गया हुआ था ए.डी.बी. की मीटिंग में, माननीय चितरंजन जी ने उसका उल्लेख किया । मैंने कोई दम नहीं भरा, मैंने केवल सूचना के तौर पर कहा था कि लोकसभा ने भारत के बजट को पास कर दिया है । मैंने केवल सूचना के तौर पर ऐसा कहा था । मैंने जाकर यह नहीं कहा कि मुझे बहुत गर्व है, घमंड है इस बात का कि ऐसा हो गया । मैं आपसे कहना चाहूंगा कि वहां पर भी चाहे वह विकसित देश के लोग रहे हों, चाहे विकासशील देश के लोग रहे हों, भारत का जो सम्मान है आज के दिन, वह बिल्कुल साफ नज़र आता है और हम ही एक ऐसी आवाज़ हैं जो पूरी मजबूती के साथ विकासशील देशों के प्रश्नों को वहां पर रखते हैं । दुनिया के बाकी जो विकासशील देश हैं, उनकी जो दुर्दशा है खासकर पूर्वी एशिया के जो देश हैं, उनकी जो दुर्दशा है, उससे हम सब भली-भांति परिचित हैं । इसलिए यह जो हमारी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय जिम्मेदारी है, उसको हम पूरी तरह निभाते हैं ।

महोदय, यह जो गरीबी का सवाल है, उसमें एक पैराडॉक्स है और पैराडॉक्स यह है कि एक तरफ तो हम जिसको कहते हैं साईंस ऐंड टेक्नोलोजी का कटिंग ऐज, चाहे वह रिसर्च ऐंड डेवलपमेंट हो, आज हम में यह क्षमता है कि हम कम से कम समय में नए-नए मॉलीक्यूल्स डिस्कवर कर रहे हैं। आई. टी. के क्षेत्र में हमने जिन ऊंचाइयों को पा लिया है, वे दुनिया के लिए उदाहरण हैं । एक तरफ तो भारत का यह चरित्र है, छवि है और दूसरी तरफ यह भी सच है कि 32 करोड़, 35 करोड़ लोग आज भी गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने के लिए विवश हैं । यह पैराडॉक्स है क्योंकि यह देश कई सदियों से और शायद इतिहास की हर सदी में कोई न कोई वर्ग गरीबी रेखा के नीचे जी रहा है और हर सदी की हमें चिंता करनी पड़ेगी। इसीलिए यह जो सरकार है श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नेतृत्व वाली, इसकी आर्थिक नीतियों के बारे में अगर मैं संक्षेप में सदन को बताऊं तो इसमें एक तो हमने ग्रोथ यानी प्रगति यानी आर्थिक विकास की दर तेज हो, इस पर जोर दिया है । इसीलिए हमने आने वाले 10 वर्षों के लिए 7-8-9-10 परसेंट ग्रोथ रेट का लक्ष्य रखा है । जैसा कि कहीं प्रधानमंत्री जी ने कहा था कि more growth and more growth. यह हमारा निर्णय है क्योंकि गरीबी और बेरोजगारी की समस्या से निपटने के लिए ग्रोथ का तेज होना, विकास की दर का तेजी से आगे बढ़ना बहुत आवश्यक है । लेकिन हम सिर्फ यहीं पर नहीं रुक जाएंगे । अगर ग्रोथ होगी और ट्रिकल-डाऊन होगी तो समस्या का समाधान हो जाएगा ।

महोदय, हमने अपनी नीतियों में इस बात पर बहुत जोर दिया है, जिसको हम गरीबी पर सीधा प्रहार कह सकते हैं, कि हम रोजगार के नए-नए अवसरों का सृजन करें । अब यहां पूछा गया कि रोजगार के नए अवसरों का सृजन कैसे होगा ? सड़कें बनेंगी, उससे होगा । मकान बनेंगे, उससे होगा। हम आई. टी. और नॉलेज इंडस्ट्री के क्षेत्र में काम कर रहे हैं, उससे होगा । स्वरोजगार के माध्यम से होगा । इन सबसे रोजगार के अवसरों का सृजन होगा ।

महोदय, इसी के साथ-साथ जो क्वालिटी ऑफ लाईफ है खासकर हमारे ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में, उस क्वालिटी ऑफ लाईफ की ओर हमारा विशेष रूप से ध्यान है और इसीलिए आपने देखा होगा कि हमने इस साल के बजट में एक प्रधानमंत्री ग्रामोदय योजना की शुरुआत की है जिसमें हमने सिर्फ 5 मूल मुद्दों को रखा है - जिसमें ग्रामीण सड़कें हैं, पीने का पानी है, आवास है, स्वास्थ्य है और शिक्षा है। इन 5 मुद्दों को लेकर हमने एक योजना बनाई है जिसके लिए हमने 5,000 करोड़ रुपए का प्रावधान अलग से किया है । इन सब मुद्दों के लिए कुल मिलाकर 13,000 करोड़ रुपए का प्रावधान हमारे बजट में है । इन सबके मूल में मुख्य बात

7.00 P.M.

है आर्थिक विकास और इन सब माध्यमों से हम रोजगार के अवसरों में वृद्धि करेंगे । मुझे लगता है कि पिछले 2 वर्षों में जिस प्रकार हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था में सुधार हुआ है, आने वाले दिनों में हम और तेजी के साथ आगे बढ़ सकेंगे और यह जो बजट हमने इस साल का बनाया और जो हमारे सामने यह विनियोग विधेयक है वह उसी श्रृंखला की एक कड़ी है और मैं आशा करता हूं कि यह सदन सर्वसम्मति से इसको पास करेगा। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक) : प्रश्न है कि:

"वित्तीय वर्ष 2000-20001 की सेवाओं के लिए भारत की संचित निधि में से कतिपय राशियों के संदाय और विनियोग को प्राधिकृत करने वाले विधेयक पर, जिस रूप में उसे लोक सभा द्वारा पारित किया गया है, विचार किया जाए।"

The motion was adopted.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): अब क्लॉज बाई क्लॉज के साथ इस विधेयक पर विचार करेंगे।

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Sir, I move:

That the Bill be returned.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक): अब हम कल दिनांक 9-5-2000 के पूर्वान्ह 11 बजे तक के लिए उठते हैं।

The House then adjourned at three minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 9th May, 2000.

MGIPRRND—2277 RSS/2000—300